

# METHODIST REVIEW.

---

JANUARY, 1892.

---

## ART. I.—THE VIRGIN-BIRTH—ITS EXPECTATION AND PUBLICATION.

CHRISTENDOM declares that Jesus was *born of the Virgin Mary*. Thereby is held that Mary, the lawful wife of Joseph, without carnal knowledge of man, gave birth to her perfectly human son Jesus. Alleged universal counter-experience, and fondly dreamed fathomings of the mysteries of life's origin and transmission, may not rise up in judgment with the belief that humanly Jesus had no father, so long as stand fast the less graspable biblical beliefs that the first woman had no mother, and the first man neither father nor mother. With Augustine,\* the mysterious event and all its sufficient causes are held beyond dispute and gainsay. As, however, the softening of *ad hominem* arguments and the abating of faulty premises can but the more comfortingly cause to appear the ever-broadening bases by which the tops of the mountains of truth are verily upheld, it is the present aim to ask, of the Scriptures chiefly, when the idea and knowledge of the virgin-birth entered the public mind? and what evidence there is that the hostile Jews of Christ's day knew of and denied such claim? It is proposed to ask whether, upon crossing the vestibular thresholds of Matthew and Luke, gospels penned from sixty to eighty years after the events they narrate, a torch is not handed us the rays of which set Jesus's being and life in a light had by none who knew him in the ministering days of

\* "Hoc pie credimus, hoc firmissime retinemus, natum Christum de Spiritu Sancto ex virgine Maria."—*Sermo li.*

1—FIFTH SERIES, VOL. VIII.

his flesh save Mary? whether in order to put ourselves in their places, know their struggles, and feel their infirmities we must not humbly empty ourselves of much knowledge gained solely from later events?

With expectation of the Messiah—the Prophet like unto Moses (Deut. xviii, 15, John i, 45), the eternal Son of David (2 Sam. vii, 11, 12, Psa. lxxxix, 3, *f.*, Luke i, 32, 33), the Redeemer of his people (Isa. lix, 20, Luke xxiv, 21)—glows page on page of Holy Writ. That, however, he was to be humanly fatherless is not so apparent. The clearest form of the expectation, namely, that he was to be virgin-born, is claimed to be read but once (Isa. vii, 14). Leaving until later a consideration of this passage, the records will be applied to the following all-inclusive, mutually exclusive theories.

Either virgin-birth was a feature of the Messianic expectation or it was not. The first theory divides itself into (1) an expectation B. C., which may be (*a*) indefinite, or (*b*) personally definite; and (2) a credential A. D.

An indefinite anticipation of this kind must have left its deep impress upon life, both public and private. A keen lookout for this most unique and vital event in the life of the Jew and the race must (1) have called forth some official method for clearly discerning this mark in the eagerly awaited Messiah. Such alone could prevent fraud on the part of intentional deceivers and imposition on the part of guilty maidens seeking to justify their condition; such alone could screen the selected virgin from public scorn and the arm of the law. But, while officials strained their eyes to sight the new moon, no such official watch is known or hinted in this case. At least such was not on hand to deter Joseph from granting Mary leave to withdraw, and all Jerusalem was surprised by the strangers' rumor of the birth of David's eternal heir. Further, besides the doors for fraud and vice thus opened upon society, such an indefinite anticipation (2) could have been no less blighting upon maidens of piety just in proportion as they coveted the blessing—if a blessing they could esteem it. If every maiden having such holy wish, especially those espoused to royal heirs, procrastinated the wedding-march to her husband's house until all hope of a virgin-birth had died by expiration of time, the line of David must early have become extinct.

True is it that the definite focusing of this expectation upon Mary banishes these specter ills, but only to bring into sight others more fearful. The limitation of anticipation to Mary might have been secured by (1) a process of continuous division, as in the cases of Achan and Joshua. Or (2) the Romanist's doctrine of Mary's immaculate conception by her mother would here be acceptable, for European art galleries swarm with scenes of Mary's birth and her girlhood's reception in the temple by the bowing and bedizened priesthood. Or (3) the conjunction of Daniel's "weeks" with the espousal of Joseph, a royal heir—perhaps the very last—to Mary, herself of David's seed, might have converged all thought upon her. But in this phase of the matter the thoughts, the words, and the acts of both Joseph and Mary become utterly unintelligible and psychologically impossible. If by birth, blameless childhood, espousal to Joseph, or by any other method Mary was thus marked and singled out, why those divorce plans in Joseph's mind? Gabriel having predicted to her the conception of the Messiah, Mary's response to the angel, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man," is diametrically opposed to the idea of a virgin-birth having been entertained on her part.

Let the expectation of the virgin-birth as to definiteness or indefiniteness be what it may, it is thinkable (1) that Mary should at once have communicated to Joseph the message of Gabriel, and the glad news of the nearing fulfillment of the most definite and marvelous prophecy on record, for that she truly interpreted and fully consented to the angel's message before any corroboration on the part of Elizabeth is shown by her final word to Gabriel, "Be it unto me according to thy word."\* Furthermore, (2) her sudden and apparently unmotivated departure from home and from under the eye of her bridegroom's friend, her lonely week's travel through Ephraim's mountains, and her sojourn in a strange city, were all highly unwise and calculated to discount her claim. Again, (3) her condition in due time appearing, according to custom the mediator between the contracting parties (*pronuba*) doubtless gave Joseph notice. But notice of what? That the long-foretold, hourly expected, perhaps even definitely located vir-

\* Irenæus, Tertullian, and others go so far even as to claim that the conception took place upon her pronouncing these words. See their notes on the passage.

gin-conception had actually taken place in Mary? The thought is inconceivable. The words in Matthew are, that "she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." Surely against such a conception there is no law. The honored cause no less than the honorable fact being certified to Joseph by those who were equally convinced thereof, he was *not* "a righteous man" to think of shunning her as one who had "wrought folly in Israel" (Deut. xxii, 21). That he after Mary's conception, as well as Mary previously, was divinely and privately informed of the real state of the case is perfectly clear. Does, however, the evangelist teach that the Holy Ghost's agency was known to others at the time of the event, or does he give it as the true explanation and ripened belief long current in the Church at the time of his writing? Upon this theory also (4) the dream-angel adds to what Joseph already knows and has long expected—dire uncertainty alone, for, while the naming of the child *Emmanu-El* (a name formed like *Samu-El*, *Jo-El*, and *Dani-El*) was as distinct a feature of the Isaiah passage as was the announcement of the virgin-birth, Joseph is here told that he shall name Mary's child *Jesus*—a name in sense and structure unconnectable with the other.\* Since, again, (5) Joseph's unique and publicly recognized relation of adoptive foster-father could as well be decreed *after* birth as before; and as the angel's language implies no haste, as in the warning to flee to Egypt, every sense of propriety would have suggested, as every law of evidence demanded, a delay of the formal marriage until after the birth. Unwedded motherhood, which for all others had been deepest shame, had been highest glory for her. The course taken,† however, according to the thought and code of all civilized peoples, gives color to a belief the exact opposite of the theory and of the facts stated, and has thrown into the world a bone of endless controversy. Marriage, moreover, (6) for the usually alleged sake of legitimating his birthright claim to the throne of his father David, presupposes two great improbabilities: general agreement, name-

\* So far as recalled no apostolic Father ever calls Mary's son *Emmanuel*; certainly no New Testament writer so calls him, or even pens the word independently, while every such writer in every book (save John iii) does call him *Jesus*.

† Said by Chrysostom (Homily IV) to have been taken *ἵνα πᾶσαν πονηρὰν διαφύγῃ ἡ παρθένος ἐπιδόσθαι*, in order that the Virgin might escape every evil insinuation, a view just the opposite of the present theory.



ly, that in such a remarkable case as this inheritance could not be from his mother alone, and that in a claim to the Messianic throne prenatal adoption could give an unquestioned title.

These are but samples of the thorns and thistles besetting the pathway of the theory that the virgin-birth was a feature of the Messianic expectation in time B. C. Passing thence to time A. D., the theory demands the expected virgin-birth as *a*, if not *the*, Messianic credential. Under this view the presence or the absence of this mark must have provoked intense and all-absorbing discussion, for silence can be accounted for only on the ground (1) of universal and discussionless knowledge and belief of such birth—that is, that all accepted him; or (2) of total and debateless ignorance and disbelief of it—that is, that none held him to be the Messiah. On the contrary, it is recorded that there arose a division in the multitude because of him (John vii, 42). Some believed and some disbelieved. What proportions this discussion must have assumed, and what a “burning question” it must have become, can scarcely be imagined by post-pentecostal theology. (1) An atoning, “God-like” death upon the cross, a declaration of divine Sonship by the resurrection from the dead, an ascension, a declared sitting at the right hand of the Father, a shedding forth of the Holy Spirit upon all believers, with the fulfillment of minute prophecies and clear promises as to one and all of the same, were no evidence of his Messiahship, shed no light upon his nature, for those with whom, and as long as, he *lived*. Nor, again, (2) was it by new teaching and doctrine that he was to certify himself to the world. While he did teach with authority, and not as the tradition-mongers, he ever avowed that he came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them. To the end he taught that eternal life hangs upon the keeping of the commandments. All apparently new commandments are in essence but the old commandment which was from the beginning—that of perfect love. A new teacher he was, but his teaching was neither new nor identifying. Nor, furthermore, (3) could miracles, genuine and supernatural, indubitably distinguish him. The fact that God works miracles through a man of Nazareth (Acts ii, 22), the son of Joseph (John i, 45), can it convince that the same is the virgin-born Messiah of expectation? One may turn six water-pots of water into wine (John ii, 6, *ff.*), and still the Galilean sea (Mark iv, 37, *ff.*);

but the son of Amram's loins turns all the waters of Egypt into blood (Exod. vii, 20, *ff.*), and parts the Red Sea (Exod. xiv, 16, *ff.*). One may walk upon the water (Mark vi, 49), multiply loaves and fishes (Mark vi, 37, *ff.*), bid lepers show themselves to priests for certification of being cleansed (Luke xvii, 12, *ff.*), and raise the widow of Nain's son (Luke vii, 11, *ff.*); but Shaphat's son makes iron to swim (2 Kings vi, 6), multiplies the cruse of oil (2 Kings iv, 2, *ff.*), bids Naaman be cleansed of his leprosy in Jordan (2 Kings v, 10, *ff.*), and raises the Shunammite's son (2 Kings iv, 20, *ff.*). One may heal the centurion's servant without going to him (Luke vii, 2, *ff.*), but the sick are laid where the evening shadow of Peter may fall upon them and they are healed every one (Acts v, 15, *f.*). The hem of one's garment may wholly heal a suffering woman (Mark v, 25, *ff.*), but handkerchiefs or aprons from Paul's body also cure many of their diseases (Acts xix, 12). One may raise Jairus's daughter (Mark v, 35, *ff.*), but Peter raised Dorcas, and Paul, Eutychus (Acts xx, 9, *f.*). One may even be in a resurrected state, and, taking a piece of broiled fish, may eat before the eleven (Luke xxiv, 41, *ff.*). But before this Lazarus, brother of Mary, is in a resurrected state, and at the Bethany supper sits at meat with the company (John xii, 1, *f.*). As far as recorded, the miracle of the resurrection of the body of Jesus of Nazareth essentially differs nothing in outward appearance and efficacy from that mediated by the bodies of non-Messianic sons of men.\* Lacking, then, the great final evidences of his being and mission later given in his exaltation, and undecided by his miracles, was it sheer stubbornness which led the authorities again and again to ask, "Who art thou" (John viii, 25)? "By what authority doest thou these things" (Matt. xxi, 23)? "What sign showest thou unto us" (John ii, 18)? "How long dost thou hold us in suspense? If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly" (John x, 24, R. V.). Was it aversion to truth which led the masses to say, "When the Christ shall come, will he do more signs than those which this man hath done" (John vii, 31, R. V.)? "We have heard out of the law that the Christ abideth forever: and how sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up? who is this Son of man" (John xii, 34)? Some said, "This is of a truth the

\* "Miracles, as such, are no test of truth, but have been permitted to, and prophesied of, false religions and teachers."—*Alford*, on Matt. xii, 27.

Prophet. Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, What, doth the Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said that the Christ cometh of the seed of David, and from Bethlehem, the village where David was" (John vii, 41, *f.*, R. V.)? Was it a closing of the eye to the light which led his forerunner to ask from prison, "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another" (Matt. xi, 3, R. V.)? or which led Philip, one of the first confessors of his Messiahship, in sorrowful confusion as late as the last supper to beg, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us" (John xiv, 8)? In such a chronic state of query, if this unique and identifying virgin-birth was expected by all, and was claimed by himself and friends, some mention of it by friend or foe is psychologically demanded; some record of its discussion must appear in our documents if they are of historic value.

But long and varied, fierce and deadly, as waxed the controversy over him and his claims, the subject of the manner of his birth was never broached. That (1) during Jesus's life Joseph was regarded as his procreator our records show no doubt; that the relation was held to be merely adoptive they give no hint. Physical fatherhood was professed by Joseph's taking home his pregnant espoused.\* Doubtless without note or comment was the child enrolled in the census of Quirinus as of the house of David. At circumcision Joseph exercised the father's function of naming the child. At the proper season "*the parents* brought in the child Jesus, that they might do concerning him after the custom of the law" (Luke ii, 27, R. V.). As no law was made for the case of one virgin-born, and as no exception to the law is here mentioned, "his father and his mother" were doubtless deemed to be such physically, the one as much as the other.† In speaking to Jesus of Joseph, Mary uses nothing but "thy father" (Luke ii, 48). Contradicting

\* Such would be the reasoning *a fortiori* from Deut. xxii, 29.

† The phenomena in connection with the translation of these terms of relationship are very interesting:

Luke ii, 27, ἐν τῷ εἰσάγειν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον.

Vulgate, Cum inducerent puerum Jesum parentes ejus.

Wiclif, 1380:	Tyndale, 1534;	Rheims,	Authorized,	Revised,
his fadir and	Cranmer, 1539;	1582 (Roman	1611: his par-	1881: his par-
modir leddan	Geneva, 1557:	Catholic): his	ents.	ents.
the childe.	the father and	parents.		
	mother.			

Here, with undoubted text before them, all the earlier translators saw nothing

apocryphal disproportioning of respect, it is told that through life, a Jewish lad true to the fifth commandment, "he was subject unto *them*." Where, during life, any querying is mentioned, as "Is not this Joseph's son" (Luke iv, 22)? "Is not this the carpenter's son" (Matt. xiii, 55)? "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know" (John vi, 42)? the query is ever as to *his identity*; as to *his relation to Joseph, never*. Nor do the peculiarly worded genealogies of Matthew and Luke oppose this view. That in Matthew, penned two generations later, closes: "And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ" (Matt. i, 16). Are we taught that this language was literally copied out of some official roll upon which each new relation had been entered as it was consummated; or does he give a table compiled and characterized by himself in the light of subsequent events, and expressive of the facts as known to the Church at his writing? Plainly the latter, for an official which protested against Pilate's superscription would never at any time have penned the last clause. The list agrees not with parallel lists in the Old Testament, and it is inconceivable under what category any *concrescive* genealogy, official or family, would contain of women only the five named, or would omit names enough, and at the right places, to throw the list from Abraham to Christ into three tables of double-sevens separated against their rendering *γονεῖς*, *parentes*, as "his father and mother." Exactly the same phenomena occur in verse 41.

Luke ii, 33, best manuscripts, *ἦν ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες*; poor manuscripts, largely Latin, *ἦν Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες*.

Vulgate, *Erat pater ejus et mater mirantes*.

Wiclif: his fadir and his modir weren wondrynge.	Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva: his father and mother.	Rheims: his father and mother.	Authorized: Joseph and his mother.	Revised: his father and his mother.
---	--	--------------------------------------	--	---

Luke ii, 43, best manuscripts, *οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ*; poor manuscripts, *οὐκ ἔγνω Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ*.

Vulgate, *Non cognoverunt parentes ejus*.

Wiclif: his fadir and modir.	Tyndale, Cranmer: his father and mother.	Rheims: his parents.	Geneva, Authorized: Joseph and his mother.	Revised: his parents.
------------------------------------	---	-------------------------	---	--------------------------

In the last two passages it is noticeable how, in contrast with the fearlessness of the earlier versions, and the faithfulness of the Rhemish (Roman Catholic), the Authorized entertained some motive for differentiating the relations. The Revised restores to consistency.

by David and the captivity. Again, "Jesus himself, when he began to *teach*, was about thirty years of age, being the son (as was supposed) of Joseph, *the son of Heli*," etc. Luke penned this perhaps two generations after the time of which he treats. The unevenness of form at the beginning clearly betrays a belief, at the time of writing, in something extraordinary. But does he mean to say that at about the year A. D. 26 men speak to their neighbors of Jesus (1) as "being the son (as is supposed) of Joseph;" or (2) as "being the adopted son of Joseph;" or (3) as "being the son of Joseph," with no more suspicion thereon than that he is the son of Mary, or than that John is the son of Zebedee? Plainly neither of the former, for no such forms of speech are recorded. Plainly he meant the latter, for, just at this period of life, Philip thus discovers the Messiah to Nathanael: "We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph" (John i, 45).

The absence of all allusion to the virgin-birth by friend and foe is by some attributed to the necessary inclusion of that fact in the term Son of God as autonymous to procreation by man. But, (2) however much truth later events and later Christology may have found in or brought into that term, did it *then* imply the exclusion of the man's sonship? If it did, then every Old Testament use of it demands that sense, begetting only confusion there. The term also, even more distinctly than the Isaiah passage, must have begotten anticipation of a virgin-birth in time B. C., which has been found so conflicting with the records. But the whole claim is in direct opposition to the thought and words of both Philip and Nathanael (John i, 45-49). Philip had found and fully distinguished the Messiah. On theory, his distinguishing mark is that he is the virgin-born Son of God, as opposed to being the son of Joseph or of any man. Overjoyed, he findeth Nathanael, to whom he discloses the one found, by giving name, residence, and parentage: It is Jesus of Nazareth, the son of—Mary? No. Of God? No. The son of *Joseph*! Nathanael, of course, objects to the definition. The Israelite in whom is no guile stoutly demurs. To what? To the impossibility of Jesus's being the Messianic virgin-born Son of God if he is the son of Joseph? Not in the least, but to his hailing from cross-roads

Nazareth.\* Led to the stranger, by one question he gains like precious faith with Philip, and cries in true Hebrew parallelism and synonymousness, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art King of Israel" (R. V.). But that this expression indicates views as to his parentage different from those held and worded by Philip is unhinted. And this is all the more notable as being written by John, than whose gospel no book of the twenty-seven is more authentic, and than which none purposes more plainly to convince of the deity of Jesus Christ. Yet his language as to Joseph's relation is in no case qualified, as is that of Matthew and Luke. That, therefore, during Jesus's life the claim to be the Son of God was understood to exclude all human progenitorship is not at all evident.

Nor, again, (3) was the expectation of the virgin-birth a remnant of the true faith preserved alone in saintly circles, nor was it an esoteric teaching of Jesus. True, the Baptist declared to the official commission of inquiry, "In the midst of you standeth one whom ye know not" (John i, 26). But with the next breath he twice confesses similar Messianic ignorance himself, saying, "I knew him not" (John i, 31, 33). (The tense is that of continuous past action, meaning, "I was not knowing him as the Messiah until I saw the Holy Ghost descending upon him.") This John could not have truthfully said if in the circle in which he had grown up was whispered the unforgettable fact of the identifying virgin-birth of his kinsman, or if, as even Meyer will have it, at the meeting of the prospective mothers he, the forerunner, had recognized and saluted the Messiah. The same agrees not with the unbelief of his nearest relatives, be they brothers or only cousins. Such private teaching must, moreover, have been discovered by spies, or tried by some of those who walked no more after him, or by Judas. And, finally, Jesus flatly denies any private doctrine: "I have spoken openly to the world; in secret spake I nothing; ask them which heard me" (John xviii, 20, f.).

But, lastly, upon this theory nothing is so astounding and inexplicable as the absence from our records of all hint that during

\* While it is unfair to suppose from the expression "son of Joseph," as Lücke and De Wette have done, that the history of Jesus's birth as given in Matthew and Luke was unknown to John (Alford), it is just as unfair to imagine that it was known to Philip.

his life-time the hostile Jews ever turned the subject of his birth into bitter scorn and mockery. That our writings are not one-sided and partisan is clear from the fact that revilings upon other subjects are unhesitatingly set forth. "A gluttonous man and a wine-bibber" (Luke vii, 34), who "receiveth sinners, and eateth with them" (Luke xv, 2); "thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil" (John viii, 48); the mockings upon the cross—all these sneers are honestly spread upon the records. Not shunned is the Jewish perversion of the account of the resurrection, which "was spread abroad among the Jews, and continueth until this day" (Matt. xxviii, 11, *ff.*). But there is never a breath of Jewish scandal as to his birth. That *later*, for fifteen hundred years, the Jews regarded a perversion of his claim of virgin-birth as their keenest weapon is but too clearly seen in both Christian and Jewish literature. Since the year 1645 the Talmud has been purged of its score or more base allusions to Jesus, doubtless because they had surreptitiously crept in or because the Jews knew them to be baseless.

Such is the reception which the records give to the theory that the virgin-birth was a feature of the Messianic expectation. Turning thence to the alternate theory, apart from much which has been suggested for lack of space, the reader is simply invited to read the gospels under the light of the theory that the virgin-birth was *not* anticipated, nor during Jesus's life once thought of as a credential. In so doing it is believed that every difficulty will either wholly disappear or be largely minished.

But it is honestly and fearfully objected that so interdependent and vitally joined are definite prophetic expectation and stupendous miracle, that dissipation of the former annihilates all belief in the latter; that the twain having become one flesh, what God hath joined together no man, without slaughtering the faith, may put asunder. To many the acceptance of this miracle seems largely to depend upon its having been prophesied. A moment's thought, however, will show that the expectation-begetting power of definite prediction as an aid to faith in miracles is greatly overestimated, if not practically *nil*. Take, for example, the resurrection of Jesus the third day. If *definite* prophecy is anywhere on record it is the one concerning this event at the *other* end of Jesus's earthly life. With prophecies hourly fulfilling themselves before their eyes; with



such fresh proofs of prescience as the finding of the colt and the furnished supper-room, the betrayal by Judas and denial by Peter; with an observation of Jesus's resurrecting power in public and private; with the possession of the same power themselves; with the knowledge of the predicted miraculous *beginning* of his life; with clear prophecies of his resurrection in the Old Testament; with the solemnly more than thrice repeated definite prediction of death and resurrection, and with the first of these events literally fulfilled—that not one of his followers, not even *his mother Mary*, expected or for a moment dreamed of his rising from the dead that first day of the week, but that spices were brought for permanently interring the body, and that even his words were remembered by his foes alone, is a striking case of the incertitude of the expectation-begetting power of a *definite* prediction. A chronometrically precise prediction of the date of his rising not only failed to prepare his followers therefor, but totally hinders our understanding of the history—is, *in fact, actually in the way*.

As expectation from a definite prediction is exactly the trouble in the case of the virgin-birth, it will not grieve our readers to learn that *all* do not hold to the existence of such a feature in the Messianic expectation. True, on the one hand, Strauss, the mythist, vows that such expectation existed, and that out of it, as from fertile soil, grew the *myth* that Jesus was so born.

Renan, the romancer, holds that when the enthusiast Jesus took up the role of the Messiah the fabulous birth was in order, corresponding with a misunderstood chapter of Isaiah where it was believed to read that the Messiah would be born of a virgin.

Harnack, the great modern church historian, teaches that the dogma grew out of the Isaiah passage, but no passage in his writings is recalled where he can be made to confess belief in Jesus's virgin-birth any more than Strauss and Renan.

Bishop Pearson, the learned seventeenth century expositor of the Creed, prefaces his proof (?) of the perpetual virginity by striving to establish the expectation of the virgin-birth by all Jewish interpreters.

But, on the other hand, Alford, the conservative nineteenth century Dean of Canterbury, scorns the latter's proofs of the perpetual virginity, and says as to the other (on Matt. i, 23-25): "Can it be shown that the birth of the Messiah from a *παρθένος*

[virgin] *was a matter of previous expectation?* Certainly Pearson (on the *Creed*, article iii) fails to substantiate this."

Weiss, the continuator of the Meyer Commentaries, affirms that the existence of such an expectation cannot be proved.

Having found the *absence* rather than presence of such expectation, and accepting the fact of the virgin-birth, one can have nothing in common with the first three authorities, but will hold with the last two to the fact, but not to the expectation.

The second question then arises, If the virgin-birth was not anticipated nor discussed as a credential when was the fact published? While Jesus's Messiahship—his office—was made known to Elizabeth, the shepherds, and others, nothing shows that the facts of his birth, of his person, were included therein or added thereto. Joseph never broaches it—quite naturally. If it took an angel to assure him of the honesty of his chastely walking Mary, after taking her to wife, in the absence of all prodigies in the child he might well have despaired of being believed. Dying, probably, before Jesus's manifestation, he doubtless took all his knowledge to his grave. Nor, again, would Mary during the same time be inclined to reveal the matter. Daring not to tell Joseph, finding a divine providence convincing him when necessary, she may well have trusted the same to bring forth the truth when and where proper. So fixed, indeed, became this frame of mind in her that Luke twice notes it: "But Mary kept all these sayings (or things), pondering them in her heart" (Luke i, 19, 51).

While, then, (1) many believed on him as the Prophet who was to be raised up from the midst of them, like unto Moses (man's supposed fatherhood not excepted) (Deut. xviii, 15, Matt. xxi, 11, Luke xxiv, 19, Acts iii, 22); and while (2) all knew him as claiming to be the (Heb.) Messiah, the (Gr.) Christ, the (Lat.) Anointed King of Israel, the son of David in the sense that Solomon was, yea, to be the Son of God in the same sense, but greater degree, than were angels (Job xxxviii, 7, Ps. xxix, 1, *marg.*, lxxxix, 6, *marg.*), Solomon (2 Sam. vii, 14, Ps. ii, 7, *f.*), and Israel itself (Exod. iv, 22, Hos. xi, 1, Isa. lxiii, 16, Jer. xxxi, 9, 20); yet, (3) that the sufferer upon the cross was *not* the physical son of Joseph, but *was virgin-born*, was undreamed by any, was known by none—save Mary.

In harmony therewith says Peter in his second post-Pente-

costal speech to the Jews: "Ye denied the holy and righteous One, . . . and killed the Prince of life. . . . And now, brethren, I wot that in *ignorance* ye did it, as did also *your rulers*" (Acts iii, 17). Is Peter truthful here? If not guilty of a *lappus linguae*, or of a euphemism for "unbelief," he can only mean that to the last man of them (Mark xiv, 66, *ff.*) there was an *ignorance* of the uniqueness of his person which now by his exaltation had been made manifest. Of his works, words, and claim to be the Messiah, the Son of God, they were *not* ignorant. If, as some claim, Sonship of God necessarily implied miraculous birth, their rejection of him was in *unbelief*, not in *ignorance*. *Ignorance* can only mean that before his death, resurrection, and exaltation there was totally unknown a decisive evidence as to his nature, which, by these last events, had been otherwise made known with power.

For, then, the publication of the fact of his virgin-birth there appears before his exaltation no moment when Mary's regard for modesty or for personal safety would have dared whisper it, or when faith could have grasped it. But in the light of the resurrection and exaltation of her Son, of the outpouring of the Spirit, the continuous working of mighty miracles, and the conversion of thousands, what more natural than that the long-closed heart should open and that the long-sealed lips should attest to the other Marys, to Peter, to John and Luke, the long-pondered, the now believable (John iii, 4, 13, xvi, 12), the now explained and explanatory fact, of his virgin-birth?

Finding, then, and needing, no prophetic expectation of the virgin-birth, merely to keep promise, Isa. vii, 14 must be asked if it is truly predictive; if it could honestly beget such expectation.

Ahaz, in perplexity or error, in his siege by the two kings, was given a sign or warning by Isaiah (see Revised Version); whatever the circumstances, to be a sign to him it must be fulfilled, or have a fulfillable sense, *in his time*. If *virgin-birth* was the *pivot* of the matter *later*, it must have been in Ahaz's time, giving the world *two* miraculous births; or if none such occurred, then Isaiah's word failed; neither of which conclusions satisfies. The meaning to Isaiah and Ahaz is believed to have been this:

An *almah* (now pubescent and probably unmarried) shall conceive (doubtless as a married woman, with no hint at supernaturalness) and bear a son, and shall call his name (either because of the

plenteous butter and honey-eating times, or from the mighty deliverance he brings) Immanu-El, God is with us.

As so read, the sign had nothing more extraordinary than other temporal signs and prophecies made by Isaiah and other prophets. This may be called groundless judgment, and the passage held to be distinctly predictive on the ground that (1) the Greek *parthenos* always means one sexually ignorant, (2) that in the Jews' Greek translation (the LXX.) *parthenos* and the Hebrew *almah* coincide in use and meaning, and (3) that *almah* always means one sexually ignorant. But as none of these statements is strictly or universally true\* it cannot be admitted

\*In order that English readers may at a glance see the true relation of these words we tabulate condensed passages below.

1. The Greek *parthenos* (abstract *parthenia*, parthenon at Athens = virgins' abode) is almost universally used of sexual ignorance. For rare exceptions, see Thayer's Lexicon and Ellendt's Lexicon.

2. The Greek word *parthenos* and Hebrew *almah* are not coincident. The Hebrew *bethulah* (abstract *bethulim*) is the technical term for one sexually ignorant, one yet in her father's house. The Hebrew *naarah* is the feminine to *naar*, a youth, one whose puberty is evinced by a base, hoarse voice. *Naarah* = female of same age. *Almah* is the feminine to *elem*, from a root meaning to be strong, full of sap, especially sexually ripe. Note the use of these words. The first three passages which the LXX. translate by *parthenos* are bracketed at the right.

*Bethulah* (*bethulim*), Gen. xxiv, 16: The damsel was fair, a *bethulah* (virgin, Vulg. *virgo*), neither had any man known her. Exod. xxii, 16, 17: If a man entice a *bethulah* (virgin, Vulg. *virgo*) and lie with her, he shall pay dowry of *bethuloth* (virgins, Vulg. *virgines*). Deut. xxii, 13-21: I found not the tokens of *bethulim* (virginity, Vulg. *virgo*).

*Naarah*, Gen. xxiv, 14: Let the *naarah* (damsel, Vulg. *puella*) to whom. Gen. xxiv, 16: The *naarah* (damsel, Vulg. *puella*) was very fair.

Deut. xxii, 20: If tokens of *bethulim* (virginity, LXX. *parthenia*, Vulg. *virginitas*) were not found in the *naarah* (damsel, LXX. *neanis*, Vulg. *puella*), stone her.

Note the discreet exchange of *bethulah* for *naarah* when the case is proved; Luther changes from *jungfrau* to *dirne* (= Eng. wench). Here *bethulah*—*parthenos*—*virgo*—*jungfrau*—*virgin* is carefully distinguished from the *naarah*—*neanis*—*puella*—*dirne*—*damsel* by the proof of unchastity, and yet in Gen. xxiv, 16, the same LXX. translate both Hebrew words by *parthenos*.

Ruth ii, 5, 6: Whose *naarah* (damsel, LXX. *neanis*, Vulg. *puella*) is that? Ans. The Moabitish *naarah* (damsel, LXX. *pais*, Vulg. Moabite) that came with Naomi. Here the *naarah* was a widow, doubtless so known to the answerer, as "all the city was moved about" the women (chap. i, 19).

Judg. xix, 1, ff.: A Levite took a concubine (see also 2 Sam. xx, 3, and Ezek. xxiii, 20, *paramour*) who played the harlot, and went to her father's house four months. Her husband went to bring her back, and when the father of the *naarah* (damsel, LXX. *neanis*, Vulg. *ejus*) . . . saw his son-in-law, etc.

This use by the LXX. of *parthenos* (Gen. xxiv, 9-16) for the word *naarah*, which

A word not excluding but sometimes implying sexual knowledge.

LXX. *parthenos*.

that the Seventy instinctively knew and marked Messianic passages. From usage noted, therefore, whether the Hebrew *almah* of Isa. vii, 14 is a *parthenos* (strictly) or a *neanis* (as the other Jewish translators give it), and even whether the Greek *parthenos* is a *bethulah* or a *naarah*, depends not upon any inherent definiteness of meaning in the words, but solely upon the facts in any given case. In the face of a sufficient fulfillment in Ahaz's day, of the unbroken laws of procreation, and of the usage of language, it was psychologically impossible beforehand to read in or into Isaiah's words any such event as took place in Mary. After, however, the miraculous unexpected had established itself in addressing a people tied to the letter, used to instruction and persuasion by verbal coincidences and interpretations most fanciful, one himself so habituated would allege as corroboration of, and otherwise established fact, its prediction in the verbally coincident Isaiah passage. This is believed to be the rabbinical character and the true secret of the five enigmatical fulfillments in Matt. i, ii, given in support of facts actually resting upon other and solid grounds.\* The kind father, eager to lead to desirable conclusion, builds oftentimes an

sometimes implies knowledge of men, entirely upsets any claim built upon their alleged critical translation of *almah* (Isa. vii, 14) by the same word.

Having seen two different Hebrew words for which the LXX. use *parthenos* we now refer to three different Greek words they use for *almah*:

(1) *Parthenos*. Gen. xxiv, 43: The *parthenos* (maiden, Vulg. *virgo*) which cometh to draw, let her be the *ishshah* (woman, LXX. *gunē*, Vulg. *mulier*). Exod. ii, 8: Pharaoh's daughter said, Go. And the *parthenos* (maid, Vulg. *puella*) went. Isa. vii, 14: A *parthenos* (virgin or maiden, Vulg. *virgo*) shall conceive, etc.

(2) *Neanis* (plural *neanides*. For possible uses of this word see above, Deut. xxii, 20; Ruth ii, 5; Judg. xix, 1-5). Psa. lxxviii, 25: Minstrels followed the *neanides* (damsels, Vulg. *juveniculae*). Cant. i, 3: The *neanides* (virgins, Vulg. *adolescuntulae*, love thee. Cant. vi, 8: There are threescore queens, and fourscore concubines, and *neanides* (virgins, Vulg. *adolescuntulae*) without number. Note these three classes. If the latter were true virgins why did the LXX. incorrectly say *neanis* instead of correctly saying *parthenos*? If they were not true virgins, what does the use of the Hebrew *almah* prove as to its meaning?

(3) *Neotēs*, a young woman. Prov. xxx, 19: The way of a man with a *neotēs* (maid, Vulg. *adolescuntia*). Same remark as before.

3. *Almah* is not proved to mean one sexually ignorant.

\* Matt. i, 22, f., ii, 5, f., 15, 17, f., 23. Notable is it that, (1) No other New Testament writer makes such or any use of them. (2) One (ii, 23) cannot be found in the Old Testament. (3) At least three, if not all the other four, would never strike

argument upon premises as held by a child which he would not for one older, nor later for the same child grown wiser. The Saviour himself, lacking better holding points, used conventional premises. As, therefore, each mind and age advances in knowledge, the truth we hold will often find itself resting actually upon grounds other than those once premised. What! will we make the word of none effect? God forbid; nay, we will establish it. He who has himself been born again, and is now risen with Christ, can have no aversion to miracles—which are such. Will he see Jesus as he was, he must learn him as did the twelve. He will turn down the leaves of Matt. i, ii, Luke i, ii, John i, 1-18, so far as they make known virgin-birth and pre-existence. Reading the gospels and onward into Acts, he will there learn Jesus as they of his time came to know him. Ever querying more sharply, Who is this? Who art thou, Lord? there will wrestle *a man* with him until the breaking of the day and the shedding forth of pentecostal power by the risen and glorified One. Gasping, "Tell me, I pray thee, thy name," he will read in Luke, the beloved physician, of the virgin-birth, and in John that he has striven with *God*. Casting a glance at Matthew, to his predicted fulfillment, will he say, Now believe we, *not because of thy speaking*, for we have heard for ourselves and know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world, he who is now in the bosom of the Father, who was in the beginning with God, and who became man, *being—Born of the Virgin Mary*.

a person knowing the Old Testament alone as at all Messianic. (4) The other synoptists, in all their use of the Old Testament, never see any such fulfillments. (5) As the earlier editions of Meyer on Matthew asserted that none of the synoptic gospels in the form now before us came from an eye-witness of the events, one is not grieved, but faith is strengthened to learn from last editions (7th and 8th, § 4) that the peculiar fulfillments discovered and alleged in chapters i, ii, were not in the documents which Papias, Irenæus, and all the church Fathers say Matthew composed for the Hebrews in the *Hebrew letters and language*, but are the aids to faith contributed by the zealous Jewish Christian who published the Matthew document in its present form for the Greek-speaking Jews of the Diaspora. See also Weiss, *Einleitung*, § 47.

Wilbur Fletcher Steele.

## ART. II. — GENESIS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

[SECOND PART.]

SPEAKING more specifically, careless "higher critics," in disparagement of the integrity of the Bible, have said more than once that it was the Council of Trent which decided what books should and what books should not constitute the Bible. How absurd! That council did not convene until the year of our Lord 1545. Hence the canon of the Old Testament, we are safe in saying, had been decided on fifteen hundred years before that council assembled; and the New Testament books, as to their constitution and divine authority, had been established beyond possible disturbance or change more than a thousand years before that council met. What, therefore, if the Council of Trent, or earlier church councils or synods from the second century down, had voted at various times, as they did, that the books now composing the Bible are canonical, and that all others are apocryphal? What if the papal Church had added to the canon seven books, as it did, not now found in our Protestant Bible? Are we to be disturbed on these accounts? Or what if those people had wrangled day and night about the authorship of the books of the Bible? What if they had even cut out with shears, or had mutilated in other ways, such writings of the Bible as they judged unfit? What if they had pasted into the Bible the rulings of church councils and other theological dogmas to their entire satisfaction? Need the world be troubled? These councils, be it remembered, appeared too late on the scene to do harm. Such ecclesiastical actions and decisions have nothing more to do in affecting the questions now before the Christian world than if they never had taken place. They have no more significance in the judgment of thoughtful people than would the vote to-day of any American church assembly that all the books now constituting the Bible, and no others, are canonical; no more significance than would the vote of some Methodist conference or of some Congregational council to reject the Epistle of James, and insert in its place the sermons of John Wesley or those of President Edwards. The action of five hundred thousand church councils after the second century, as it appears



to us, would not and could not make the slightest difference as to the original constitution or authority of the Old and New Testament Scriptures.

But this "higher criticism" distemper has not been confined to church councils. More than one early and scholarly Christian, as well as others of later and of late date, while exercising the right of private judgment, have claimed that certain books now in the Bible ought to have been rejected, and that other books which are just as good as any of those now composing the Bible ought to have been made canonical. In different communities this individual judgment, a form of "higher criticism," began within three hundred and fifty years after Christ.

Certain leaders in the Eastern Church about that time objected to the Apocalypse because of its contents: they could not understand it, and concluded that it was not inspired, and that it should therefore be dropped from the Bible.

Here was the exercise of private judgment. So, likewise, certain members in the Western Church at an early date objected to the Epistle to the Hebrews because their private judgment suggested to them that Paul would not have written some things contained therein.

There were persons who objected to the Second and Third Epistles of John on the ground of their brevity; they reasoned, as they thought wisely, that if John had composed those letters he would have written more at length.

Still others objected to the Epistle to Philemon because of its private character. There were Christian scholars who thought that the Epistle of Barnabas and the first Epistle of Clement ought to have equal authority with the canonical New Testament writings.

Augustine made little distinction between the Apocrypha and the other books. Origen wanted to insert in the Bible the Book of Baruch, and Athanasius wanted to reject the Book of Esther. This Book of Esther, especially because the name of God does not appear in it, was looked on coldly by a large number of the early critics. Jewish rabbis more than once expressed the opinion that it should be excluded from the canon. It was omitted from the list of canonical Old Testament books given by Melito of Sardis. It was likewise omitted

from the list given by Gregory Nazianzen. Athanasius was inclined to rank it with the non-canonical books, and Luther suspected it. Luther's "higher criticism" extended to other books, and with regard to some of them was pronouncedly heroic. His final judgment was, that "Isaiah borrowed his whole heart and knowledge from David," and that "the history of Jonah is so monstrous that it is absolutely incredible." "The Epistle to the Hebrews is," said Luther, "void of apostolic authority." He also said that "St. James's epistle is truly an epistle of straw;" and he added that "the Epistle of Jude allegeth sayings and stories which have no place in Scripture."

Though more mildly expressed, Melancthon's judgment coincided with Luther's. Erasmus, one of the most learned fathers of the Reformation, thought that Hebrews, Second Peter, and Revelation should have no place in the sacred volume. Zwingli rejected the Apocalypse, and Ecolampadius placed James, Jude, Second Peter, Second and Third John, and the Apocalypse along with the Apocrypha. Calvin did not consider Hebrews to be the work of Paul, or Second Peter to be the work of the apostle whose name it bears. He likewise criticised the book of Revelation because it was to him unintelligible, and the pastors of Geneva were prohibited by him from all attempts at its interpretation; and the celebrated Dr. South scrupled not to pronounce it a book that either found a man mad or left him so.

But more than this; there are scholars in our day who feel at liberty, practically, to reject portions of the Bible, and it is well to bear in mind that they have just as good reasons and rights for doing so as had Augustine, Erasmus, Luther, or Calvin. There are among us, too, preachers who never take a text from the Old Testament; others who never take one involving the rigors of the law or the doctrine of future punishment; and still others there are who regret that the words devil, hell, and the like appear in the Bible.

Overzealous prohibitionists wish that the account of the wine-miracle at Cana had been expunged from the gospel record, and are much troubled by reason of Paul's advice to the dyspeptic Timothy.

The stalwart Arminian easily dispenses with the eighth chapter of Romans, and the stern Calvinist can get on admirably

without the ninth chapter of that same epistle. The extreme Unitarian votes down the first chapter of the Gospel according to John; and of what conceivable use to the Universalist is the twenty-fifth chapter of the Gospel according to Matthew?

Many of the "higher critics," first and last, have assailed the scientific and historic subject-matter of the Bible, asserting that it is full of errors. Others of them judge that the materials composing the Bible are not well proportioned. One would prefer a Bible having more poetry, and others would prefer one having less. Some, if left to decide in these matters, would suggest more history and biography, others less. There have been and are differences of opinion as to how much prophecy and how many proverbs should enter into a Bible compilation. A few extremists in the school of "higher criticism" have suggested that the Bible would be much improved by the building into it of passages from Sophocles, Euripides, Homer, and Virgil; they would introduce into it passages from the British and American poets and essayists, and for spice would insert choice passages from McDonald, Dickens, George Eliot, and some, perhaps, from Robert Ingersoll, while their rejection of what is now in the Bible would be such as to make an honest man cringe. In fact, if "higher critics" all along had had their way and their say not much, if any, of the original Bible would be left in our possession.\*

But our readers need not be told that the world's second sober thought often reverses, and frequently is better than its first; we trust that such at length will be the outcome and experience of our friends, the modern "higher critics."

A few examples of this improved second thought may be instructive. The Jewish rabbis in the days of Ezra and later on, for instance, thought that the books of Moses were so much more sacred than the Psalms of David that the manuscript rolls of the two should not lie so as to touch one another. But modern Christian judgment would far sooner lose from the Bible the writings of Moses than the Psalms of David.

\* A few years ago we were informed by the author of a book entitled *The Religion of Humanity* that the Free Religious Association had commenced to write a Bible for humanity, and that "one scholar has been toiling long in the British Museum, collecting and sifting the materials of which it might be composed." We hope he is still at work; we are anxious to see this new Bible.

Many of the rabbis refused to rank Daniel on a par with Ezekiel. But the Christian world now lifts Daniel onto at least as high a plane as the one accorded to Ezekiel; Daniel it is who had the vision of the coming Son of man, which Christ appropriated to himself.

It is now acknowledged that no book of the Bible teaches more beautifully the lesson of an overruling Providence than does Esther, though omitting throughout the name of God. And this offense is now fully pardoned, for no slight was intended; the name of Deity was omitted because the book was designed to be read in Jewish homes during feasting times, and it was far more reverential to omit, under such circumstances, direct mention of the name of God.

The very reason that led Luther to reject the Epistle of James, namely, that it emphasized "works," leads others to feel that the Bible would be defective without that epistle; and had Luther lived longer and got further away from his antagonism to every thing papal he would not have asserted so emphatically as he did his right of "private judgment" as to what books should, and what ones should not, be included in the Bible.

The reasons that have led one man lightly to esteem the eighth chapter of Romans, and another to object to the first chapter of the Gospel according to John, and still another to pass by the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, have led others to feel that the Bible would be incomplete if deprived of these very portions. The book of Revelation, though among those the oftenest criticised in the past, is now regarded as one of the most wonderful of the prophetic books, and one of the sublimest productions in the realms of literature. The apocryphal books, which some of the church fathers and many of the papal councils decided to be of the same value and authority as the other Scriptures, are now decided by the world's best scholarship to be utterly unworthy of a place in the sacred volume.\* Bible statements relating to scientific matters which once occasioned no little uneasiness are now used as evidence of Bible

\* The apocryphal books of the Old Testament are not found written in the Hebrew tongue; they were never received by Jews as canonical; none of them are found in the catalogue of Melita, Bishop of Sardis, in the second century. Most modern critics agree that for the most part they are nothing but romances which sprang up after the return of the Jews. The judgment of Dr. Kitto is approved by nearly all modern scholars. He says: "Every attentive reader must perceive

inspiration, while the researches of antiquarians are daily verifying historical statements of the Bible that formerly were disputed. Indeed, there is a wide-spread conviction, which is ever deepening, that the "higher critics" have been too much in haste while announcing conflicts between the Bible and the facts of science and history; and that after the philosophies and the sciences have run their small or mighty rounds of investigation, and after men of the broadest culture have returned from their most daring explorations in the heavens above and in the earth beneath, and after the remaining hidden treasures of Bible lands are brought to light, even then the Sacred Book will be found by curious hints or by explicit statements to have anticipated, or at least to be in harmony with, the grandest discoveries that shall be made.\* Nor will it be surprising if the very high critics belonging to the Free Religious Association, when compiling their Bible for humanity, shall be compelled to select their account of the origin of life from Moses, their psalms and songs of praise from David, their sublimest epic from the Book of Job, their most beautiful ones from the Books of Esther and Ruth; and their most startling prophecies from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and John. What more inspiring epistles could they select than those of Paul, and where else, in the whole world's literature, except in the gospels, could they find their portraiture of the ideal man? In a word, when these Bible-makers come to us bringing the results of their most careful searchings, is it not possible that they will have in their hands nothing except the Old and New Testament Scriptures?

With regard to the authorship of the books of the New Testament we need not hesitate to say that now, after years of adverse criticism, the trend of the best scholarship, as in

that these fourteen books lack the majesty of inspired Scripture, and that there is in them a variety of things wicked, false, and disagreeing with the oracles of God."

As to the New Testament Apocrypha, we are sure all "higher critics" will accept the statement of Ernest Renan. "It will be remarked," he says, "that I have made no use of the apocryphal gospels. These compositions can in no wise be put upon the same footing as the canonical gospels. They are flat and puerile amplifications, based upon the canonical gospels, and adding to them nothing of value."

\* We would enlarge on these matters had the ground not been canvassed in *The Bible and the Nineteenth Century*."

the case of the Old Testament, is decidedly toward the traditional view.\*

We must now take up the historic thread that was broken off in order to give place to a review of the foregoing "ill-advised statements" regarding the genesis and composition of the New Testament.

The rapid spread of Christianity during the apostolic age, and in the years immediately following, called for many manuscript copies of the writings of the apostles; but these original documents were in process of time worn out, and of necessity gave place to copies that were fresher and in consequence more desirable. Still, there are in existence a few manuscripts of very early date. There is no reason for doubting that the old Syriac version was made either during the first century or, at the latest, in the first of the second. Two other Syrian versions were made, the one as early as the fourth, the other in the tenth, century. The different Egyptian versions were made in the second and third centuries. The various Arabic versions or translations are properly assigned to the seventh and eleventh centuries, inclusive. The Ethiopic version is no doubt correctly referred to the first half of the second century.

There are other important extant versions belonging to the fourth, fifth, ninth, and tenth centuries.

Portions of the New Testament were also translated into the Saxon tongue as early as 706. The first English version was made in 1290. Wiclif's translation was completed in 1380, and Tyndale's printed edition of the New Testament was published in 1526. At that time also began an enthusiasm among the people for Bible-reading such as never before had been known. As a result several other editions followed in rapid

\*This is especially true of the younger professors in the German universities, and they are the men who soon will be taking the places of the destructive critics. It is gratifying, also, that some of our American "higher critics" are "traditional" with regard to John's gospel, notwithstanding the many doubts that have been expressed as to its genuineness. Professor Ladd speaks of "our unshaken confidence that the fourth gospel is by the hand of the apostle John." "For myself, I firmly believe," says Professor Thayer, "that the fourth gospel, in spite of all counter-indications from within and without, will yet vindicate itself as the work of the apostle John." These are only the beginning of concessions yet to be made. See Schürer's article on the Fourth Gospel, in *Contemporary Review* for September, 1891.

succession, all paving the way for the so-called English version of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, which was completed in the seventeenth century.

During the years that witnessed this evolution of the English Bible there had been from time to time certain perils that threatened its integrity. That is, after Romanism had taken the place of Christianity the Scriptures for a time fell into disuse; the edicts of popes and of councils came to be regarded as of greater authority even than the revelations of the Bible. The Council of Toulouse (1229) positively forbade the general reading of the Bible. Said the Romish priests to Tyndale, "We would better be without God's laws than the Pope's bulls." The Council of Trent decided that the traditions of the Church ought to be added to the Holy Scriptures in order to supply their defects, and that those traditions should be regarded as of equal authority with that of the Scriptures. This council also accepted the apocryphal books as authoritative, and ordered their enrollment in the sacred canon. In various ways and at various times papal ecclesiastics attempted the corruption of the text of the Latin Bibles held in their possession, and several manuscript copies were altered to suit church interpretations. In some instances the original text of valuable Bible manuscripts was washed out and the legends of monks were inscribed in its place.

Not only were there these papal attempts, but other profane hands sought to corrupt the text. In the reign of Charles I. there arose a general traffic in Bibles. They were made for sale, and made to gratify the gross notions of the people. The Stationers' Company printed an edition that would answer the desires of modern New Lights, in which the "not" was omitted from several of the commandments. "Thou shalt steal" and "thou shalt commit adultery" was the reading. In this edition the mistranslations, interpolations, and omissions were astounding! The danger was that these changes would be handed on, and that the reading public could not distinguish, except with great difficulty, if at all, among the several English Bibles, the spurious from the genuine.

Did we say there was danger of this? We should not have said so, for, according to our working hypothesis, the Bible is a God-made and not exclusively a man-made book, and we now



add, a God-protected book; therefore emergencies and contingencies have been provided for.

It is not uncommon to trace the hand of Providence in the great historic events of this world. In our own national history the dullest student has not failed to see the leadings of the Infinite One. Take a single case that happened during the war of the rebellion. For months the Confederates had been at work preparing something named the *Merrimac*, with which to sink Northern shipping. With no special design of preparing to meet it a something had been constructed, by whose direction or authority it is now impossible to tell, named the *Monitor*; just in the nick of time it appeared and wrought its victory. Men who had not believed in Providence up to that day then believed! But the evidence of divine interposition is far less conclusive in this case of the *Monitor* than in the case of the provisions which have been made for protecting the Bible against any essential change or corruption of its text, and against the possibility of its destruction.

This conclusion calls for a moment's attention. The care with which the early Jewish scribes guarded the integrity of the Old Testament has been often remarked. At the time when the New Testament was finished and added to the Old, the great thoroughfares of Rome were in readiness on which to carry it to nations near and remote. There was at that time universal armistice between the Roman empire and all nations of the earth, of longer duration than ever before or ever afterward. It was likewise the age of Rome's political supremacy. Beginning with Spain, and passing through Gaul, Germany, Italy, Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Carthage, round to the Pillars of Hercules, we find that those countries were then subject to the same central power. At that time to be a Roman citizen secured a passport anywhere in the civilized world. It was an age, too, when the same language prevailed in all countries bordering on the Mediterranean Sea—a language which scholars have decided to be remarkable in its strength and flexibility, and adapted in a special degree for enshrining and transmitting ordinary facts and spiritual truths.

Was it not a marvelous accident, if accident it were, that brought the completed Bible onto the stage at that epoch, arranging that this remarkable language, with local modifica-

tions modifying its elegance but not its power of accurate delineation, should be the vehicle of intercommunication, and that the words and life of Jesus, humanity's Redeemer, should be held in its deep, rich, and versatile embrace?

By various agencies the Holy Scriptures had been circulated to such extent, during the early years of their history, that neither the papal nor any other power could harm them.

Aside from versions written in the Latin and English tongues there were a score of other versions which dangerous ecclesiastics and the Stationers' Company could not touch; there were, too, the Talmudic commentaries, the Septuagint, the Syriac, the Ethiopic, and other translations which were held by Eastern Churches that had never submitted to Roman Catholic supremacy. The most ancient manuscripts we now have were never touched by Roman Catholic hands, and were never seen by Roman Catholic eyes, until after they had been committed to Protestant Christianity.

In a word, no sooner had the Holy Scriptures been enlarged so as to comprise both the Old and New Testaments than they passed from the guardianship of Jewish scribes, who, owing to certain revelations adverse to Jewish thought, were tempted to meddle with them, and were committed to the Christian Church; and before that Church became corrupt the Old and New Testaments had been translated and scattered in various antipopish countries, while some of the Romish copies passed into the hands of pious monks who would not corrupt them nor allow them to be corrupted. The solid and gloomy walls of monasteries during those ages when Europe was deluged in blood guarded the sacred volume from fire, sword, and pillage.

At length only scholars could understand the Hebrew and the New Testament Greek tongues, and, with few exceptions, the priests were too ignorant to read the mysterious volume which was chained to the walls of their cells.

The Roman empire gained ascendancy. The Latin tongue struggled for universal conquest, but broke in pieces, forming the various languages of modern Europe. Latin remained the language of the Church, and the Vulgate version was alone consulted by the clergy. Thus the Hellenistic Greek, in which the New Testament was originally written, became in Church and State, like the Hebrew, a dead language.

During the ascendancy of Roman Catholicism, during the tramp of nations westward, during the rise and decline of different civil administrations, and during the development of the Italian, Spanish, French, Anglo-Saxon, and English languages, there were reposing, in the death-grip of two dead languages, the Old and New Testament Scriptures. No embalming, seemingly, could have been more perfect, and no seclusion could have been safer.

The Reformation broke upon the world! The monasteries were unlocked! The stately Hebrew and the Hellenistic Greek Scriptures were brought forth, and were found to be without harm. Untiring researches in all countries containing different versions subsequently were made by devout Christians, and also by skeptical critics. The New Testament edition of Griesbach, published in 1775-77, ushered in the golden age of modern criticism. With unexampled research, untiring study, and critical examination such men as Wetstein, Lachmann, Tregelles, and especially Tischendorf, have brought the Bible text to a degree of perfection such as belongs to no other body of ancient literature.

So wonderfully has this book been preserved that though scores of authors were engaged in its construction, though centuries have intervened since its completion, and though a large number of manuscripts have been consulted, still, as we have seen, nothing in the field of literature is more surprising than the insignificance of the alleged discrepancies and various readings which have been discovered. The opinion of Professor Norton, already referred to, is concurred in by Kitto, Dr. Adam Clarke, Professor Tischendorf, Dean Alford, Dr. Tregelles, and Professor Immer, that all the variations of the ancient manuscripts put together would not change a single doctrine or a single important truth found in the Bible.

Throughout the history of this wonderful book it has made seemingly no difference whether men have stabbed or embraced it; all the same it has advanced, and is advancing, to the conquest of this world. Singularly enough, it has shared, in part at least, the trials and the triumphs of the Messiah. The history of the word inspired has been, in more than one respect, like the Word incarnate!

Our Lord had a true humanity. He was tired, he was

hungry, he wept, he felt like a man ; and men, looking at these manifestations of true humanity, said to themselves, "Is he not the carpenter's son? Do not we know his mother and his sisters?" It is so with this book; it has a true humanity. "The words are printed upon common paper, with common letters—you put the same in your newspaper; it is printed with common type—other books are so printed; it is printed with common ink—other books are so printed;" the spelling of it is governed by the same rules as govern the spelling in other books, and men say—some few men say—"O, this is only a book among the multitude of books! Are not its brothers and sisters in our libraries?" But the devout student never fails to find underneath this thin vesture of speech, dialect, type, ink, and paper pulsations that are more than human! The Messiah lives; this book lives; and Providence has seemed to repeat again and again the saying, "My word shall not return unto me void."

The distribution of the Scriptures over the world in recent times has also been a marvel. With the rise of modern civilization and the development of various philanthropic movements among the nations the Bible commenced a journey characterized by sublime earnestness. It commenced its modern career in the secret closet of a solitary translator and in the obscurity of an unimportant town. Emerging from the monasteries where it had been shut up, and from stone walls to which it had been chained, breaking the fetters of dead languages in which it had been written, it passed at length into the open chamber of a congress of eminent scholars, in the heart of the English metropolis, where it was translated. Since that date nothing in literature matches its progress.

The Bible and its history have become a grand standing miracle among men. After having passed through persecutions and exiles almost without number—after having been trampled under the feet of kings and tyrants—after having been handled by hypercritical Jewish scribes and cunning Romanish priests and learned critics of every class, early and late—it still lives, and lives essentially in all its original purity and integrity! It has gone into the courts of princes and rulers. It has gone into the libraries of colleges and universities. It has gone into the humble homes of the millions. It has gone down into cellars and up into attics. It has stood in the presence of publicans

and sinners, refusing to leave or forsake them. It is found on land and on sea, in railway stations and in houses of public entertainment. It appears in every page of modern history. It is to-day speaking in more than two hundred different languages to the widely scattered children of men. Never before since it was written has it had such numbers of devout and critical readers. The sun never sets on its closed pages; not a moment, day or night, but some of earth's inhabitants, in health or sickness or by the bed of death, are reading its sacred pages.

In view of the origin of these Old and New Testament Scriptures—in view of their eventful history and of their present exaltation among men—may we not now claim for them without fear of contradiction every thing that was suggested at the outset in our working hypothesis? Surely the Christian Church has made no mistake in calling this Bible the *word of God*. Men chosen and inspired settled long ago the canon of the Old Testament; Christ and his apostles in their day received that canon as divinely authoritative—the New Testament, quoting from the Old nearly six hundred times; the apostle John and his co-laborers in their day decided what should be the constitution of the New Testament; ancient existing manuscripts have secured to the world an essentially uncorrupted text. Friends of the Bible may be pardoned if they shout for joy.

Our last word is, that in proportion as men have believed this “word of God” and have obeyed its precepts they have found peace and prosperity; in proportion as they have lightly esteemed it and departed from its precepts they have found distress. And he that follows its counsels will be led to heaven as surely as by following a sunbeam one will reach its source in the sun.\*

\* A mistake occurs on page 862 in the November number. The sentence relating to the “Muratorian Catalogue” should read: This Catalogue is incomplete, but gives nearly the same books, etc. We would like to add this statement, that the omission of the Gospel according to Matthew and of the Epistle to the Hebrews and those of James and Peter from the “Muratorian Catalogue” is easily accounted for, and that there are abundant reasons for the supposition that they are entitled to a place in that Catalogue. See Westcott on the *Canon of the New Testament*, page 190, etc., and Harman’s *Introduction*, etc., page 430, etc.

Luther J. Townsend.

## ART. III.—THE PROBLEM OF EDUCATION IN THE SOUTHERN STATES.

THE men who founded the New England colonies believed in schools for all the people. They not only established universities and colleges for higher education, but they provided schools for the masses. The true democratic idea, that governments are for the benefit of the individual citizen rather than for any favored class, found expression in systems of free public schools for the children of all—rich and poor alike. The other northern colonies partook of the same spirit touching the education of the masses, and when the great North-west Territory was opened up the same purpose, born of philanthropic patriotism, insured provision for the education of the masses at the public expense. It was not without a struggle that the victory was won; but at last in every State and Territory throughout the northern section of our country the idea became crystallized in constitutions and legal enactments that it is the duty of the State to provide at least primary and secondary educational facilities for all its youth at public expense. The slave-pen and the public free school-house have never yet, and never can, flourish side by side. The permanent establishment of public school systems made the further extension or permanency of slavery impossible in the North.

What the New England colonies in the matter of education were to the northern colonies and the widening westward territory, where their ideas and methods prevailed, Virginia was to the southern colonies and to the territory westward to the Rio Grande. Virginia not only did not want free public schools for the masses, but condemned them. Class ideas prevailed, Government was for the favored few rather than for individuals irrespective of social standing. In the provisions for education there was no plan to reach all the people. Later on the English parochial system prevailed. As the South grew in territory and population some universities and a fair proportion of colleges were founded, and in later years some of the Southern States made attempts at the establishment of public school systems for the whites; but the success was very meager. The stigma of pauperism rested on them, and in some cases.

Georgia, for example, pupils had to acknowledge themselves paupers before they could attend. If the institution of slavery had not flourished in the South, and its development and protection grown to be the supreme thought of her leaders, time and the incoming of more diverse populations and industries would, no doubt, have overcome these class ideas as affecting education.

Slavery not only widened the breach between the aristocratic leaders and the poorer whites, but brought in a third class, namely, Negro slaves, whose education, in the judgment of the slave-holding class, could not be permitted. Many even doubted the possibility of their education. So it came to pass that opposition to popular education at the public expense, and the development of the institution of slavery, made efficient public school systems in the Southern States well-nigh impossible. The South had its universities and colleges and parochial schools for the whites. It is claimed that in proportion to the white population—and it must always be remembered that when a Southern man speaks of "our people" he means only white people who sympathize with Southern institutions—there were more in Southern colleges than in the North. But beyond these special schools but little provision was made for the education of the white people. As to the Negroes, for many years before the war it was a penitentiary offense to educate them. The theory was that to educate a Negro was to spoil him for a slave, and also make it possible for him to be influenced by outside literature, and thereby endanger the institution of slavery. It seems strange that to insure his enslavement it should be made a penitentiary offense to educate the Negro, and that, after his freedom came, so large a proportion of the Southern white people believed he could not be educated at all.

Sections 28 and 29 of the Louisiana Black Code read as follows:

Whoever shall, with intent to produce discontent among the free colored population or insubordination among the slaves, write, print, or distribute any thing having a tendency to produce discontent among the free colored population or insubordination among the slaves therein, shall, on conviction, be sentenced to imprisonment at hard labor, or suffer death, at the discretion of the Court.

Whoever, with the intent aforesaid, shall make use of language



in any public discourse from the bar, the bench, the stage, the pulpit, or in any place whatsoever, or whoever shall make use of language in private discourse or conversation, or of signs or actions having a tendency to produce discontent among the free colored population of this State, or to excite insubordination among the slaves therein, or whoever shall knowingly be instrumental in bringing into the State any paper, pamphlet, or book having such tendency, shall, upon conviction thereof, suffer imprisonment at hard labor not less than three nor more than twenty-one years, or death, at the discretion of the Court.

Similar laws were formerly in all the Southern States. If slavery was divine in origin and approval, then the enforced ignorance of the enslaved, and the heavy penalty, even to death, for making a sign that would have a tendency to make the slave unhappy, were both logically correct. The South so thought.

The appalling illiteracy of the sixteen Southern States is therefore the result of, first, the aristocratic or class idea that education among whites was only for the few who could pay for it and would need it in their so-called higher walks of life; and, secondly, the enforced ignorance of the Negro population to insure the permanency of the institution which enslaved him.

The Illiteracy Tables of the census of 1890 have not yet been published, so that the figures given are those of 1880. It is hoped that the showing for 1890 will indicate that the illiterate masses in the South are diminishing in number. From 1870 to 1880 the number of illiterate voters and persons ten years of age and over increased. The increase of population had been greater than the multiplication of educational facilities. It is hoped that the showing for the past ten years will be better; but at best we cannot expect more than that the rising tide of ignorance has been stayed.

It is unnecessary to give detailed statistics. These are accessible to all through the Census Bureau at Washington. A few specimen statements will suffice. According to the census of 1880 there were 6,240,000 persons ten years of age and over who could not write in the United States. One third of the nation's population was in the South, but instead of only one third of the ignorance of the nation being there it had three fourths, or 4,700,000 illiterates. Taking the South as a whole, forty per cent. could not write—that is, out of every five people

two could not write. In several of the States fully fifty per cent. of the people ten years of age and over could not write their names.

Among the white people of the South the per cent. of illiteracy was twenty. That means that every fifth white person in the South as a whole could not write. Leaving off Missouri, Maryland, and one or two other border States, the per cent. comes up to twenty-five, or one in four, which is a fair average among the white people of the central Southern States. Georgia had 110,000 people of this class who could not write.

Kentucky had, by the census of 1880, 106,000, and North Carolina 96,000, white persons of the age of twenty-one and over who could not write. Tennessee had 72,000 men who could not write. These are specimen figures among the white people of very large sections of the South. The illiteracy statistics for 1890 have not yet been published by the Census Bureau, so we cannot speak definitely on the point as to whether the number of illiterates in the South has increased or diminished during the past ten years, but from 1870 to 1880 the number did increase.

In Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Arkansas there were 30,000 more white boys and girls who could not read in 1880 than in 1870. In Alabama, in the same time, was a net gain of illiterate white men and women of 11,743; in Tennessee there was a gain of 12,196; in Georgia of 9,274; and in Kentucky of 18,172.

Among the Negroes seventy-five per cent. could not write. That meant three out of four. It must be remembered that statistical figures on the subject of intelligence among people always make a better showing than really exists. Many would report themselves as being able to read and write who could barely scrawl their names with a pen or recognize them in print, and yet who would have no ability to write an intelligent letter or to master the contents of a primary treatise upon even the most practical subject.

As to voters, the South had, in 1880, 1,353,967 who could not read their ballots. Of this number about half a million were white people. The whole of the North, with twice the population, had one third as many ignorant voters. Of the voters in the South one third could not, in 1880, write their names.

The following figures give the problem as applied to voters in 1880, and also give a comparison with 1870. It is devoutly to be hoped that the comparison of 1890 will show improvement.

Number of males in the late slave-holding States twenty-one years of age and upward who could not read and write in 1870 and 1880:

Number of white in 1870.....	317,371
Number of colored in 1870.....	850,032
Number of white in 1880.....	410,550
Number of colored in 1880.....	944,424
Number of illiterates of voting age in the late slave-holding States in 1870.....	1,167,303
Of the same in 1880.....	1,354,974
Increase of illiterate voters in the South from 1870 to 1880..	187,671
Increase of illiterate whites of voting age from 1870 to 1880..	93,279
Increase of illiterate colored people of voting age from 1870 to 1880.....	94,392
Total number of males of voting age in the South in 1880...	4,154,125
Total number of illiterate males of voting age in the South in 1880.....	1,354,974
32.3 per cent. of the voters of the South are illiterate. Of the illiterates 69.7 per cent. are colored, and 30.3 per cent. are whites.	

These figures show that ignorant voters in the South increased from 1870 to 1880 nearly two hundred thousand! This is more in number than the votes cast in over twenty States at the last presidential election. Here we have the startling fact that more than two thirds of the ignorant voters of the whole nation are found in the midst of one third of our population. Other statistics show that the illiterate voters in each of the eight States having the largest Negro population exceeded in number the majority of the votes ever cast in those States at any election. In one State the illiterate voters constituted a majority of the total voting population of the commonwealth.

The difficulties which confronted the South in her educational problem twenty-six years ago were tremendous, and should be carefully considered, and, as far as possible, appreciated, when studying what has been done. The demoralization following the war was wide-spread and awful. The destruction of slavery revolutionized the labor system. Commercial methods had all to be changed. In fact, the whole social fabric had to be recast. From being the dominant factor in the national government the South lay prostrate, overwhelmed by military defeat. Her old educational centers had nearly all been either destroyed or greatly crippled. Educational funds had gone

down in the universal crash. The poverty of the South at the close of the war can never be fully appreciated by the outside world.

And it is well to remember here that the more ignorant a population is the less wealth it acquires. With the increase of the illiterate population of the South for generations its capacity for the accumulation of wealth diminished, so that it came to pass that in that section of the country where there was the most imperative demand for educational facilities the people were the least qualified financially to provide them, even if they desired to do so. In New England, with only seven per cent. of illiteracy in 1880, the average wealth of each inhabitant was \$1,040. Even in the new West, with seven per cent. of illiteracy, the average wealth was \$700 to each inhabitant. On the other hand, take the whole South, with forty-five per cent. of illiteracy, and the average wealth of each inhabitant was only \$400. In New York, with a small per cent. of illiteracy, the average wealth is \$1,500 per capita, while in South Carolina, with fifty-seven per cent. of her people who cannot write, the average wealth is only \$300, or one fifth as much as that of New York. The loose change in the savings-banks of Massachusetts—\$100,000,000—would buy one third of the taxable realty of the State of Georgia.

Then, again, it is to be remembered that the opposition to free public schools even for the whites was wide-spread, and when it was suggested that public schools must be established for the freedmen the opposition was intense, and at times violent. Concerning the education of the Negro, at first the great mass of Southern whites did not believe that he could be educated at all, and if he could he ought not to be, or, if he could and ought to be, then the people who had freed him should do it.

These and other difficulties which might be named were the legitimate outcome of forces which began operating generations before the war, and some of which were intensified during and subsequent to that struggle. It is easy to criticise those who differ from us, but the experience of twenty-two years in the South has confirmed me in the belief that scarcely, if ever, has any people been called to confront so many or more difficult problems than those which confronted the Southern white people at the close of the war.

The chief forces operating to solve the problem of education in the South since the war are, first, the national government; second, Northern patriotic philanthropy; third, Southern church and private institutions; and, fourth, public free schools.

President Grant, in his message announcing the ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment, said:

I would call upon Congress to take all measures within its constitutional power to promote and encourage popular education throughout the country; and I call upon the people every-where to see to it that all who possess and exercise political rights shall have an opportunity to acquire knowledge which will make their share in the government a blessing and not a curse.

These words well expressed the best thought of the nation toward our illiterate millions, especially the freedmen and neglected whites of the South. The first practical movement by the general government was the organization of the Freedmen's Bureau, which expended during the few years of its existence \$5,000,000, chiefly in the inauguration of educational work among that class. It was most unfortunate when, yielding largely to the intense opposition in the South to Negro education, the national authorities allowed this arm of power to be broken. It was a greater national blunder that provision for an efficient public school system was not made one of the requirements in the reconstruction of each State. The same right which justified the general government in going beyond the constitution, and dictating terms of citizenship to the returning States, ought to have been exercised in requiring that free public schools should be provided, so that the newly enfranchised illiterate citizens, both white and black, and their children, could have opportunities for at least a common school education.

The attempt to secure national aid to common schools was, unfortunately, defeated. The plan was for the general government to give temporary aid in public school work, the fund to be distributed in proportion to the number of illiterates in each State. The scheme was patriotic, constitutional, and had the precedent of large gifts in lands and money in the past to the States from the general treasury for educational purposes. Had it succeeded the blunder in reconstruction would, in part, have been overcome. The forces opposed or indifferent to the education of the masses, including the Negro, prevailed in

Congress. The chief factor against the best interests of the republic in that congressional struggle was Southern political bourbonism; and the chief ally of that factor was Roman Catholic intrigue. The former had its prototype in the first governor of Virginia, who thanked God that there were no public schools in that commonwealth; and the latter obeyed the behests of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, which, through its pope, has said that public schools are of the devil.

The only direct aid from the national government to the several States of the Union now received for educational purposes is from what is known as the Agricultural College Fund, which was begun some years ago, and recently increased \$15,000 to each State annually. In the Southern States the income from that fund, and the later appropriation, is divided between the two races, and in some cases has led to the establishment of agricultural and mechanical institutions, some of which are making excellent progress.

Northern patriotic philanthropy has in twenty-six years expended fully \$30,000,000 in the Southern States. Probably four fifths of this vast sum has gone into educational work. The results have been marvelous in the actual work accomplished in the questions settled concerning the willingness and capacity of the Negro for education, in the development of favorable sentiment for popular education, and in the influence for good exerted upon the white people of the South upon all questions relating to that subject. There have been some very large individual donations from the North, one of which is the gift of the Vanderbilts, resulting in the Vanderbilt University at Nashville, Tenn. This great institution, perhaps the greatest in the South, is under the direction of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Mr. Peabody, soon after the war, gave \$3,000,000, the interest of which has been wisely used to develop public school systems. The income of the \$1,000,000 given by John F. Slater aids in industrial education among the Negroes. Another million has been given by Mr. Hand, of New England, to aid especially in normal training. The gifts and the estate of the late Rev. E. H. Gammon, of Illinois, will probably aggregate \$500,000 for theological education. Many smaller donations have been made by patriotic philanthropists to aid the South in her educational problem.

The churches of the North, beginning at first in an undenominational effort, soon entered upon great denominational movements. The Congregational Church, through the American Missionary Association, since its organization, has expended among the colored people alone nearly \$8,000,000, most of which has gone into educational work. That society has now under its direction 66 schools, 316 teachers, and 12,095 pupils. The Baptist Home Missionary Society has expended in the same field of work over \$2,000,000, and has 26 schools, 216 teachers, and 6,165 scholars. The Presbyterian Church of the North has also expended in twenty-six years nearly \$2,000,000, and has 84 schools, 197 teachers, and 11,529 pupils. The Methodist Episcopal Church has expended in the South in twenty-six years \$8,000,000 in missionary, church extension, and educational work. This Church has in the Southern States 32 Annual Conferences, with a communion of over 450,000 members, and 16 of these Conferences are among white people. Its educational work among both colored and white people is committed to the Freedmen's Aid and Southern Education Society, and consisted last year of 41 schools, with 330 teachers and 9,310 pupils. Many schools conducted in the local churches of this denomination are not counted in this list. If they were, instead of 41 the number would probably be 200.

A fair estimate of the educational work developed and now being carried on in the South through Northern patriotic philanthropy by church organizations would probably be 250 institutions of higher grade, 1,500 teachers, and 35,000 students. This represents an expenditure in twenty-six years of, certainly, \$15,000,000. If to this be added the amounts paid for board by students, and which has been raised locally, and not included in the above, the sum would be greatly increased.

Southern churches have made marked progress in the development of their educational centers. Space will not permit of a detailed showing of this interesting phase of our subject. There has been a most wonderful revival of educational interest in Southern churches, and a corresponding increase in liberal giving by ministers and laymen.

But, after all, the chief hope of educating the masses in the South, as in the North, is in the public free school system. Sentiment in the South is steadily growing in favor of such



schools. At first the opposition among the ex-Confederate whites was, as a rule, intense. There were several reasons for this—the old opposition to public schools as such; the fact that they would mean the education of the Negro; and, last, that they were advocated by the so-called “carpet-bag governments,” which, in the Southern mind, stood as a reminder of their defeat and as representing much that was aggressive in recasting the civilization of the South.

And let it here be said, parenthetically, that it should never be forgotten that those reconstruction “carpet-bag governments,” as they have been contemptuously called, gave to the Southern States, with one or two exceptions, their common school systems, and that when those governments were supplanted the public school systems in most of those States were greatly endangered. Thanks to the rising sentiment favorable to popular education, the reaction was temporary, and there has been substantial advance each year since. Outside the cities and larger towns, however, public schools, are very few, and with the exception perhaps, of Texas public school funds are wholly inadequate. Still, the movement is forward and hopeful. One of the latest victories was gained in Georgia, when the annual school term was lengthened from three months to five. It required a whole day of heated debate in the North Georgia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to adopt a resolution asking the Legislature to lengthen the public school term. This illustrates the extreme conservatism of a large proportion of even the ministry on this subject.

A good test of the growth of public school education in the South is the per cent. of gain in enrollment as compared with the per cent. of gain in population; and we have the facts upon this point illustrated in the following table from the census of 1890, giving the apparent changes from 1880 to 1890:

	Per cent. of gain in population.	Per cent. of gain in public school enrollment.
Alabama.....	19.84	61.53
Arkansas.....	40.58	106.10
Delaware.....	14.93	19.01
District of Columbia.....	29.71	39.59
Florida.....	45.24	110.58
Georgia.....	19.14	44.47
Kentucky.....	12.73	39.37
Louisiana.....	19.01	53.52
Maryland.....	11.49	22.85

	Per cent. of gain in population.	Per cent. of gain in public school enrollment.
Mississippi .....	13.96	47.90
Missouri .....	23.56	27.64
North Carolina .....	15.59	27.08
South Carolina .....	15.63	50.89
Tennessee .....	14.60	56.34
Texas .....	40.44	133.15
Virginia .....	9.48	55.06
West Virginia .....	23.34	34.42

The increase in the per cent. of enrollment of school population in the nation during the past few years has come chiefly from the Southern States, and, if the favorable growth continues, there will, in the near future, be as large a per cent. of enrollment in the Southern States as in the North. This is certainly a most encouraging showing. The school year is much shorter in the South, and the equipment in buildings, teachers, and school funds very much poorer. And yet it is a fact that already some of the Southern States are paying as large a per cent. for public school education upon its taxable property as are some of the Northern States. When it is remembered that less than a generation ago it was a penitentiary offense to educate a Negro at all, it is simply marvelous that so great an advance should be made in public school education, in which the Negro also has a share.

According to the report of the Commissioner of Education for 1886-87, the latest at hand, there were in schools for the colored race in the South 15,815 teachers and 1,118,556 pupils; and there were in normal schools 119 teachers and 1,171 pupils. When the census returns upon education and illiteracy for 1890 are all tabulated we can then study with greater definiteness the problem of education in the South as it relates to public schools. There is much, indeed, to rejoice over in what has been accomplished; but only a beginning has been made in solving the problem of education in the South. If the rising tide of ignorance in that section is actually stayed it is all that can reasonably be expected.

Three things are especially needed now in this great work: more money, great increase in the number of efficient teachers, and a more careful study of the quality of education being given to the rising generation in the South.

It is to be hoped that the supreme folly upon the part of the South in rejecting the proffered national aid for public schools

will be followed by a very large increase in State public school funds. The burden is a tremendous one, and is made doubly so by the universal demand in the South, which as a rule is enacted in laws, that the races shall be educated separately. This requires practically two public school systems. Even George W. Cable, our ablest Southern advocate of the Negro's equal rights every-where, says in *The Silent South*, on page 33: "One thing must be said. I believe it is wise that all have agreed not to handicap education with the race question, but to make a complete surrender in that issue, and let it find adjustment elsewhere, and in the school last." This opinion is not quoted to approve it, but as indicating a phase of public sentiment in the South and not altogether unknown in the North.

Northern patriotic philanthropy must continue to do more and more each year. What has been done is scarcely a beginning. Only a small proportion of the pulpits among the seven millions of colored people in the South have as yet been filled with intelligent, efficient ministers. The Christian leadership of the nation in all sections comes from Christian schools, and the more ignorant a populace the greater danger there is that Christian leadership may not be held. Millions of the poor white and colored people in the South are in the bonds of moral, social, and intellectual degradation. No more important missionary field can be found on earth.

As to the quality of the education, it should be, as far as possible, under Christian leadership. The commercial and political power of the new and rising South is a glorious fact in which every true American should rejoice. But what shall that new South be? Shall it be the old South over again in sectionalism and race prejudice, only more powerful in ruling the nation and in riveting un-American and un-Christian social, civil, and political bondage upon millions of our brothers and sisters more galling than slavery itself?

More than any other organized moral power in America the Methodist Episcopal Church is responsible for the proper answer to this question.

*J. A. Harrell.*

## ART. IV.—THE PROVINCE OF PHILOSOPHY.

THE central figure of the earth is man. The earth was made for him. It would be chaos without him. He has over it, therefore, the right of conquest. He is superior to it and dominates it. The physical forces have their highest uses and finest illustrations in his service. The spiritual forces, also, by reason of his high investment, claim kinship with him, and they are his companions; they constitute the springs of his immortal correspondences. That man should be a creature of extreme limitations in his beginnings is of no serious moment when he has for his future an open highway.

That which distinguishes this being, and gives him his place, is the fact that he is a knowledge-gatherer. This fact has very much to do with his real life. He feeds on the truth and grows. It is the essence of his eternal being. All his senses therefore—his perceptive faculties, his reasoning powers, his intuitions—are the instruments of the mightiness involved in his powers.

What are man's methods in the search after truth? Let us formulate a brief answer to this question. And in the beginning we postulate the realism of the external physical world and also the realism of the spiritual world. Waiving some of the finer distinctions that are made by a school of the world's scholarship—chief in which is, perhaps, Mr. Drummond—the mass of mankind is not likely soon to give over the thought that there is an outside universe and an inside universe—one of matter with its code in harmony, the other of mind and spirit. To overcome a physical force is not the end of being; to ignore that force is not the end of being. Man has always builded highest in those times when he has given obedience to both sides of his being, the physical and the spiritual. The line between these two may not always be drawn. The fineness of the relationship may elude the grasp of thought at times; yet the world's faith in the duality of matter and spirit remains unshaken.

The primal and first source of all knowledge is the universe of substance and energy. The mediating sources for man are the means by which he arrives at this knowledge. These

sources are in him. They are the tentacles, they are the grappling-hooks, of his spirit in the apprehension of truth.

There is a way by which we touch nature and know it. We open our eyes and see; then we shut our eyes and think. We taste, we touch, we smell, we hear; we digest, we subsidize; we build on our attainments, and now and then we see that we have put things together by some unconscious mental process. It is so that truths of a fundamental kind are frequently made to appear through rational and inductive steps. But all truth is not at the end of the inductive process. There are realities as deep as the consciousness of being, and from the same source with it. They are essential to the life of an intelligent being—essential to its conception of a divine being. They are not evident—they are self-evident; they are axiomatic; they are *a priori*, if you please, and may have in them data sufficient to base in sound philosophy that loudest laugh of materialistic irony, “an *a priori* theory of the universe.” That there can be but one method in the pursuit of truth is a pure assumption. The truth-seeker who has not gone beyond the immediate inductive processes is yet in his swaddling-bands. Induction is necessary; it is essential. Its integrity as a method is to be proclaimed with waving of banners, but it never completes the round of truth. In the pursuit of knowledge there must be a starting-place with ultimate truths. The common standing-ground is on the substratum of basal beliefs. Man starts on his journey with some original equipments of truth—that is, they are one with his being; and in this maze of fact and fancy through which he must go they keep him from ending in confusion. They are the common magnets of spiritual force which have given human history the same features in all times, and which decide all human movements toward a final federation.

The physicist and the chemist build safely on the postulate that in matter there is an ultimate and as yet undiscovered point of force. The astronomer postulates the realism of the force of gravity—a force the real nature of which he does not at all understand. The mathematician builds his whole system on a few self-evident propositions. If these are not *a priori*, what are they? And are they not based in sound philosophy? The grounds of human belief are not to be estimated from their sources, but from their solidity. It is not true that we learn

every thing we know. Some things we must know before we can learn any thing. Some things we know before we know we know them. We act on them before they come to consciousness. It is doubtless true that experience is the mediating source for the acquisition of the greater number of facts and principles with which we are acquainted; but it is also true that as to the significance and fundamental weight of the truths, experience and observation must give place to the higher cognitions of the soul, whose first springs lie deeper than the consciousness. Count Tolstoi, the Russian nobleman and novelist, speaking of the change which came over his belief, says: "I was compelled to admit besides the reasoning knowledge, which I once thought the only knowledge, there was in every man another kind of knowledge." By the reasoning knowledge here he means such knowledge as arises from contact with the world through the senses—by test, by experiment, and by any of the methods that make it true that men grow wiser as they grow older. By the other kind he does not mean the unreasoning any more than he would say that the instincts and intuitions of a child are unreasonable; for these things in the child may be the expressions of the highest reason. He means to say that some things are known from the first impress; some things are reasonable in a self-evident way, and the soul has no power to disbelieve them. Human beings may in words deny them, and the next moment they are compelled to act on them. The philosophical basis of these first truths is as reliable and secure as any truth of the reflective reason.

Belief in originals is the imperative of consciousness. There are beliefs and feelings which sway the heart of man which are not conveyed to him by study or research; so it follows that the base of the mental building is shaken and unsteady whenever reliable knowledge is restricted to the channels of the senses. To overthrow the inward life of the soul in its voicings of truth and in its inward spiritual yearnings is to stand in the presence of facts for which no account can be given; and they are the facts which must be taken into the estimate by any philosophy that gets anywhere. Aristotle claimed that there was a "first philosophy"—a body of principles common to all inquiry, serving equally as the base of investigation in any field. That which takes in the mind the nature of a con-

elusion has a somewhat back of it. These originals of truth which have their posit in the soul have nothing back of them for us as standing-ground for argument. By no sort of reasoning or analogy do we appear to strengthen our faith in them. They are from first sources, so far as we know, and they press us with the feeling that if they are not true then there is nothing true.

More or less hinderance to clear thinking in these times, and, therefore, to the advance of the truth, arises out of the uses which are made out of two leading terms in our language.

The first is the term *science*. It is used to mean a part or the whole according to the pleasure of the user; and occasionally it is used to make a part stand for the whole, and it becomes thereby the instrument of an intellectual monopoly. It is frequently said that "science, as such, knows nothing of such and such questions; that such and such questions are not within the sphere of science; that science has nothing to do with them." If by these statements it is meant to give expression to the fact that by certain special methods some facts cannot be discovered and some great questions cannot be considered, the statements are without objection. If the microscopist comes to the edge of a chasm and says that he cannot discover the bottom of that chasm with his microscope, all hands agree; but if he says there is no other way to find the bottom of things except through the microscope, all hands dissent. If he denies the reliability of a plummet-line or a lantern, we accuse him of narrowness. Some special method takes to itself the popular name "scientific," and then assumes to cover the whole field of reliable method in the pursuit of truth, and it begs the question to carry the day. Derivatively the word *science* covers the whole field of knowledge. Whatever may be known assuredly of any reality is scientific knowledge, and the method of this knowledge, whatever its special features, is philosophic. The philosophic method is not one method, but any method by which truth may be apprehended by the human mind.

Those devoted to special research are likely to think well of their specialty, which is meet and good unless they fall into the fatal sin of claiming for it aristocracy over all others—unless they take it up and in the face of the intelligent universe say, "This is the old blue hen's chicken."



There is, indeed, great attraction now about some of the special methods of science. There is now among scholars a commendable pride in receiving nothing except on reliable evidence. There are many new and true and sure principles breaking in on us from the physical realm. The investigator has with each step assurance that he is in the presence of reliable and actual forces. So certain are his movements that he is made honest by the very integrity of his method. He comes to be very sincere. He is entranced; he loses his relish for any other method, and he is discovered with an unwitting yet craven appetite to have things done in a particular way.

To accept no fact or principle except that which can bring with it reliable evidence is well in a world so full of vagaries. To question the very ground of things is in harmony with the spirit of the times, and is productive of great good. It is doing away with much surface opinion and sentiment, and much belief which deserves no better name than superstition. It is producing a restatement of many of the evidences of religious faith. It is spoiling the old interpretation of many a text. It has brought into the popular mind a revulsion against ever receiving things *ex cathedra*. It has made of no force that old-fashioned credence to reliability which consisted in the fact that it was regular. There is a hopeful and prophetic spirit in these times which proposes for itself the work of making its own way, painfully, laboriously, into the world of minutest facts. It equips itself with pick-ax and test-tube and retort, and the thousand-featured apparatus of modern science, and goes about putting dogged questions to all phenomena. This spirit is indeed of royal temper and mold, but it is a fatal error for it to be led into the delusion that there is nothing reliable in all this universe except that which is disclosed in this or in some kindred way to the senses. There is such a thing as scientific color-blindness.

There is a form of research which has to do with the facts and forces of nature. It detects and tabulates phenomena, and in this work it only plows the surface of things. The student here may fairly say to himself, "I will not ask for the bottom facts in the case. I will deal simply with phenomena, and their first physical certainties. I will not put to my work of test and experiment any fundamental inquiry which cannot be an-

swered by the sense tests with which I am dealing." This sort of investigation is fair; it is honest and necessary in this age of specialties, but it is a case in which the investigator consents not to know many another road to truth. His compensation is in the fact that he may travel this road further, and become a pioneer and an authority. This spirit, on the whole, is of large advantage to the world; but so frequently a specialty becomes a by-way—a path in the woods leading nowhere. No specialist can be reliable in his chosen field after he has failed to acquire at second hand the world's constant product of related truth in other fields. He can make no progress after he does that which truth never does—breaks connection.

One of the greatest incidental things about the spirit of true investigation to-day is that it is not afraid of a fact. A fact made evident through the senses is accepted with all its consequences. Facts made clear to consciousness are also accepted with their consequences. And if the whole world of phenomena, physical and spiritual, shall appear as final proof that God is a sovereign in the thought and life of man, that will be accepted. If the data of history have so accumulated as to give evidence of the reality of an undying religious principle in man, that is accepted. If there is an inside intuitive testimony to the infinite, let the fact stand and give it a chance to quadrate with every other known fact, and let the outcome be as it may. Let the shadowy and unreliable be eliminated and cast out, whether in the spiritual or the physical. Deal with a mystery in the spiritual world as fairly as with the same thing in the physical, for the mysteries of both spheres are the mysteries of philosophy. To refuse investigation because of the mystery and doubt hanging about the subject would be to overturn every thing and leave no ground of confidence anywhere. The mysteries of the universe are the feeders of the mind. They constitute the stored capital of the unwasting centuries. They are invitations to the intellect to grow and live forever.

So, then, the term science is not to be handicapped for the exclusive use of any scholar or any school. It is the broad term to include all the knowledges. There is a science of matter! There is a science of life! There is a science of mind! There is a science of spirit! There is a science of God!

So also, in the second place, limits have been put on the term

philosophy. It is the province of true philosophy to furnish the mind with truth through every possible agency. It is not, as Comte thinks, limited to the consideration of the physical sciences. All departments of human knowledge are equally open to the tests of philosophy, and its conclusions are as reasonable in one place as in another, because its processes are only incidentally different as applied anywhere. Philosophy is not exclusive of any field of investigation, but inclusive of all. There are philosophers who limit themselves to certain fields of inquiry; but philosophy is not limited. Philosophy has a cleavage to run from beginning to end of all manner of investigations, and it utterly refuses to be put into the leading-strings of any special intellectual method. Some are fond of saying, "The ultimate we do not know;" and they have been trying to teach philosophy this shibboleth; but if in one way God may not be known, it is the very business of philosophy to institute search elsewhere. There shall be no monopolies in this kingdom of mind.

Philosophy has been defined as "the search after wholes;" by another, as "the search for a first cause;" by another, as "the feeling after the absolute being." Schlegel defines it as "the science of consciousness alone." Plato defines it as "the intuition of unity." Another has defined it "as the pursuit of the highest truth." Bradford defines it as "the search for God." So a larger number of definitions would reveal an equally apparent confusion on the face of things; and they might make for philosophy still greater divergent paths; but they would go to enforce the fact that philosophy is not to be confined to any special method of investigation. True philosophy is right reason applied to any thing. Philosophy travels all roads, explores all regions, is the autocrat of all intellectual methods, and is equally at home everywhere. It has no limitations but that of the mind's power to find the real.

With an inquisitorial and fearless spirit it goes out in search of the truth, for its end is universal truth. Its business is to enter the natural kingdom and compare all its known facts and draw conclusions. It is to walk among the spiritual forces and make inquiry with the calmness of an inherent right. It is to put all truth together, to show the coherence of all facts, and put into them their meaning. Aristotle says:

It is not a question of preference with us whether we philosophize or not; it is the normal, rational process. It is in the nature of mind to reason of things and their end. Philosophy is operative anywhere; it is the common element; it is the chord of similitude binding into one category the widest range of pursuits, and it fills Plato's definition that it is the intuition of unity. Its limit is the outer boundary of the human understanding. What is man? What constitutes his powers? Whence comes such a being? Why is he here? Where is he going? What is to become of him? What is this vast universe about him? What was its cause—when its beginning—its end? How is it controlled? How is man related to it and the manifest power behind it? What are the destinies of all this we see about us? This is the field and province of philosophy.

Sound philosophy has declared from the beginning that the facts of religion are on an immutable basis. The fundamental problems of religion have always been among the important, if not the most important, problems of life. But religion begins with God and his attributes, and the world has never lost interest in the search for clearer apprehensions of him. The data of religion make up many of the facts of history, which are the facts of reason, the facts of revelation, the facts of intuition and consciousness, and so numberless and strong are they that they can never be overthrown. The fact of virtue, the fact of vice, the fact of moral government, the fact of happiness, the fact of sorrow, the fact of existence itself—these are as plain as the facts of daylight and darkness, and the building constructed without them had better look well to the corners and sides of its foundation. The movement of this life through its course means something more than attention to physical facts.

Special methods may address the understanding, and in them are the applications of sound philosophy; but indeed does this sort of business catalogue the apprehensive powers. It is apparent to the broadest scholarship of to-day that there must be brought about a larger appreciation of the vital relationship existing between the great departments of special research.

We can illustrate this necessity in a couple of cases. The student of material forms sees now much where before appeared nothing. There is such order and harmony and such magnitude of law in the minutest test he applies that he is bewildered whenever he comes to any sort of generalization, and

of course he has no relish for it. He sees, what the tyro never sees, that the human mind is not able to grasp the immensity of things; so the cosmos in such a system as this appears to be out of his reach. It is not strange that he should call it the unknowable; by which he means that the great first cause cannot be apprehended by the physical forces or by the senses; and by it also he means that the limitations of man's mental life preclude his having more than the most meager knowledge of the unconditioned. How can he understand the Creator when he is bewildered with the fact that he will never be able to master more than a small part of the small forces about him? He has only been able to make a toilsome journey into the rim of his own territory. He sees there pygmy forces relative to the unconditioned, but of such vast power and extent when compared with himself that he is prone to turn about and ascribe to them infinite causation. The poor man is bewildered. He has cut loose all the leading-strings of life but one, and he has followed it into a forest, and he is alone. It is not good for man to be alone. He needs to marry philosophy. She will even court him if he will be won, and she will teach him through the rest of his life in the law of relationships, so that he will not always see as through a glass darkly.

On the other hand, the mind that has been attracted first and most strongly with the intelligent and providential forces becomes not only absorbed in but captured by his method. He finds in it remarkable properties for giving an account of things. He thinks of himself as a truth-gatherer, and its methods are delightful to him. In the study of intelligent causes and of moral government he finds vast measures of enrapturing truth, and he concludes after a while that all clear intellectual vision must be from his vantage-ground. The doctrine of God to him is a vast study. He sees conflict of thought, but he is not alarmed at it. Opposing views he is able to interpret frequently as estimates made from opposite sides of the same wonderful truth. He says that he knows God, and also with Job he says, we cannot "find out the Almighty to perfection." He is not abashed that the data of his field ranges the entire cosmos, because while much lies beyond his understanding it yet remains to him an invitation.

But the peculiar liability of this student of intelligent forces

is that in the blessedness of his communions he is likely to underestimate the value of a sound philosophical method. He does not see that even true philosophy must confirm every step he takes, and that his greatest conclusions are only secure in that they become philosophic finalities. In the exuberance of his feeling he is disposed to miss the force of the great truth, that the rational nature of the kind of truths with which he is dealing is capable of being made as clear as the rational nature of physical truth, and it is his business to make them clear. He must see that the freightage of his acquisitions is not side-tracked for want of enthronement in the reason of man.

The student who is given to details is not always prepared for an insight into this common scheme of things which constitutes one system. So philosophy, in its broadest sense, keeps science from gloom and disappointment in showing the affinity of all facts, their contrasts, their eternal co-ordinations. Its purpose is to correct and clarify and lead human thought into safe moorings. It entices all specialty of scholarship into broad and clear views of life. It takes knowledge of a particular kind, and helps it by putting it into contrasts and harmonies with that which is very unlike it in character. It puts itself against the empirical spirit every-where. It puts the calmness of honest inquiry on the face of the thinker, and helps him to recognize truth from all points of the intellectual compass. Raphael painted a picture of true philosophy when he drew a vaulted causeway with two principal figures in it. One was Aristotle, pointing forward; the other was Plato, pointing upward.

*William Riley Halstead*

## ART. V.—THE PORTICO TO OUR BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.

For several quadrenniums I have been waiting for some person more competent and less overworked than myself to call attention to the unsatisfactory character of the opening sentences of our Book of Discipline and to propose something better. As thus far my waiting has been in vain, and as there are many and weighty reasons why some change should be made at the fast-approaching General Conference of 1892, I feel constrained to put aside other duties long enough to pen myself a few words upon the subject. We do not undertake this suggestive work in the spirit of criticism, but in conformity to veritable history, and in the interest of Methodism.

Very properly our Book of Discipline opens with a section entitled, "Origin of the Methodist Episcopal Church." This is so brief that for the reader's convenience I here reproduce it entire. It is as follows:

The Preachers and Members of our Society in general being convinced that there was a great deficiency of vital religion in the Church of England in America, and being in many places destitute of the Christian Sacraments, as several of the clergy had forsaken their Churches, requested the late Rev. John Wesley to take such measures, in his wisdom and prudence, as would afford them suitable relief in their distress.

In consequence of this, our venerable friend, who, under God, had been the father of the great revival of religion now extending over the earth by the means of the Methodists, determined to ordain ministers for America; and for this purpose, in the year 1784, sent over three regularly ordained clergymen; but, preferring the episcopal mode of church government to any other, he solemnly set apart, by the imposition of his hands and prayer, one of them, namely, Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law, late of Jesus College in the University of Oxford, and a Presbyterian of the Church of England, for the episcopal office; and having delivered to him letters of episcopal orders, commissioned and directed him to set apart Francis Asbury, then General Assistant of the Methodist Society in America, for the same episcopal office, he, the said Francis Asbury, being first ordained deacon and elder. In consequence of which the said Francis Asbury was solemnly set apart for the said episcopal office by prayer and the imposition of the hands of the said Thomas Coke, other regularly ordained ministers assisting in the sacred ceremony. At which time the General Conference, held at Baltimore, did unanimously receive the said Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury as



their bishops, being fully satisfied of the validity of their episcopal ordination.—*Discipline*, 1792.

Now, ever since as a young man I first read this account it has impressed me as strikingly inadequate.

1. It is altogether too brief. Thousands of persons receive their first direct and authentic information respecting the origin of our Church from this little compendium of our doctrine and law. Many of these have had the book put into their hands in order that after examining it they may determine whether or not they would like to assent to the doctrines and submit to the rules. Others are ministers or laymen of other communions who procure the book as the one official declaration of the most important facts relative to the Church. In both cases it is highly important that these persons, unacquainted with our origin and history, prejudiced possibly against us, should find in this opening section the essential facts, and find them so stated and correlated with other facts as to produce a just impression. But how is this possible within the limits of the above paragraph? Who can duly set forth the origin of the Methodist Episcopal Church in four ordinary sentences? It cannot be done.

2. The above account is not a history of the origin of our Church at all, but merely of the origin of our holy orders. Even as such it is far from satisfactory.

3. The opening sentence is adapted to give needless offense to all persons coming to America from the mother-country or from any part of the world where the Church of England is in the ascendancy. To persons unacquainted with the original relations of Methodism to the Church of England the sentence is simply incomprehensible. How much more favorable would be the impression on all classes were the simple historic fact brought out that the liberation of the American people from the power of Great Britain terminated the existence of the Church of England in the United States, and led to the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church as eldest daughter of the Church of England, and in important respects her historic successor in America?

4. The second sentence is, if possible, worse than the first. It wholly ignores the free choice and authoritative action of the men who at the famous Christmas Conference actually organized the new American Church. It misleads the reader, giving

him to understand that our episcopal form of organization was a result of Wesley's predilection alone, and that Asbury's consecration to the episcopal office was ascribable solely to Wesley's choice. The fourth and final sentence confirms this misconception, for it seems to represent the total action of the American preachers as a mere acquiescence in what had been done in their behalf. The fact that should have been brought out is that nothing that Wesley provisionally did or proposed had any validity for or in the new organization until adopted and enacted by the General Conference of 1784 as the primary constituent assembly of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

5. It is certainly desirable that this opening chapter of the Discipline should give the uninstructed reader some just conception of the significance of our Church as the eldest of our national ecclesiastical organizations, and the largest embodied expression of the nation's religious life.

6. It should also inform him as to the attitude of the Methodist Episcopal Church toward other particular Churches, and state its view of its own relation to the Church universal.

Finally, considering the fact that the Methodist Episcopal Church possesses the unity and high efficiency of organization which characterize the Church of Rome, yet in perfect evangelical freedom; the heroism of the best Calvinistic Churches without their cold necessitarianism; the inwardness and warmth of the best Lutheran Churches without their bent to sacramentarianism; the choicest rituals and traditions of the Anglican Churches without their narrow and prelatic exclusiveness—it certainly would seem fitting that this portico to our Discipline should convey to every beholder some idea of the unprecedented evangelical comprehensiveness and catholicity of our own Church, and its consequent adaptation in the hand of God to further the blessed cause of ecclesiastical intercommunion and universal Christian fraternity.

Of course, to prepare within the necessary limits a new chapter avoiding all the fore-mentioned mistakes, and meeting all the fore-mentioned requirements, is a task of no small difficulty. I hope, however, that many of our best qualified writers will make the trial, so that by a kind of competitive effort we may secure the best possible result. To encourage others I venture to present a tentative sketch of my own:

## THE ORIGIN OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Our Lord Jesus Christ taught that his kingdom among men was to be like a grain of mustard-seed, almost invisibly small at its planting but steadily unfolding into a tree with a multitude of living branches. So has it been. Century by century his living Church has grown and spread until, in this age, its branches overshadow the continents and its fruits are found in every nation. All these branches, great and small, have a common origin; all are dependent upon a common root; all in one degree or another are exhibiting a common life. For any one of these to disown the others and to claim to be itself the sole legitimate Church of Jesus Christ is at once an offensive arrogancy and a denial of the truth of history.

But while the essential doctrines, discipline, and very life of each of the successively appearing branches of the true Church are thus historically and continuously derived from Christ, and as such are as old and as new as Christianity, it has pleased God in his wisdom and love to grant to each particular Church a distinct local and temporal calling, dependent in important respects upon the local and temporal conditions amid which it is brought into being. Particularly interesting and important is this calling in the case of all Churches called into being in consequence of the birth of new nations, and destined to develop and express upon a national, and even more than national, scale the religious life of a young and growthful people. In such cases the vigor of the wakening national life favorably affects the life of the Church, and this latter in turn strengthens and heightens the life of the nation.

On the 4th of July, 1776, the English colonies of North America declared their independence of Great Britain, and entered upon the defense of their liberties. The treaty that terminated the war and secured the international recognition of the ecclesiastical and political independence of the people of the United States was signed September 3, 1783. Fifteen months later, at the memorable Christmas Conference of Methodism held in Baltimore, the first step in the ecclesiastical reconstruction of the new nation was auspiciously taken. Sixty lay preachers, who before and during the War of the Revolution had been members of the Church of England, and who under the personal direction and government of the apostolic John Wesley had most successfully toiled to spread scriptural holiness over the American continent, assembled to consummate measures already prayerfully devised for the con-

servation and enlargement of their evangelizing work. Assisted by the advice of their venerated spiritual father, who had expressly pronounced them and their people "totally disentangled both from the state and from the English hierarchy," and "at full liberty simply to follow the Scriptures and the primitive Church," these American preachers formally organized the Methodist Episcopal Church, adopting for its use Articles of Religion and a Book of Common Prayer both abbreviated from those of the Church of England, together with a form of discipline based partly upon that of the Methodist societies in Great Britain and partly upon the Anglican canons. Among the Articles of Religion they inserted a new one containing a recognition of the new civil government, and in the ritual there was placed a "Prayer for the Supreme Rulers of the United States."

Three extraordinary clerical commissioners from England, appointed by John Wesley, were present at the Conference: the Rev. Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law, of Jesus College, Oxford University, the Rev. Richard Whatcoat, and the Rev. Thomas Vasey. The first of these had been provisionally appointed and consecrated a general superintendent of the American Church about to be organized, the other two provisionally appointed and ordained to be, with him, its earliest presbyters. All were joyfully received by the American brethren, and the unanimous election of the three to their respective offices under the provisions of the new American Discipline consummated the initiatory action of Wesley and his associated presbyters, and gave to the Methodist Episcopal Church organic form and liberty of independent ecclesiastical action. At the same time the apostolic Francis Asbury was unanimously elected to exercise episcopal supervision conjointly with Coke, by whom, with the assistance of co-presbyters in the imposition of hands, the said Francis Asbury was duly and canonically consecrated to his holy office, he having been regularly ordained on preceding days, with fitting public solemnities, first a deacon and then an elder in the Church of God. Others of the preachers were ordained deacons in accordance with the ritual, and from among these, twelve, as elders, to meet the necessities of the infant Church. Two missionaries were at the same time ordained for Nova Scotia and one for Antigua. The members of the Conference further showed their far-sighted comprehension of the needs and opportunities of the time by voting to establish at once a Christian college, and by adopting rigorous measures for the extirpation of American slavery.

Such was the origin of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the first in the new republic to attain autonomy with a jurisdiction of more than national extent. The same divine hand that originated the nation originated it. Despite the unhistorical theories of royalists and prelatists each exists *jure divino*. Washington needed no kingly coronation at the hands of George III. to render legitimate his authority as president of a republic in which George III. had himself no shadow of authority. Had England demanded this as a condition indispensably requisite to the recognition of the nationality of the people of the United States she would have displayed an arrogancy and folly even greater than she did. Equally manifest would have been the impropriety had any of the diocesan bishops of England, or even the provincial archbishops of Canterbury and York, with their territorially limited jurisdictions, conditioned their recognition of the authority of Asbury as a legitimate bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church on ordination and consecration at their hands. Whoever maintains the historic legitimacy of the republic of the United States of America cannot deny the historical legitimacy of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The apparent breach of historic continuity was greater in the civil than in the ecclesiastical sphere. In each, however, the change was not one of man's arbitrary and self-willed ordering; it was simply a vital transformation wrought by God's power in the historic unfoldment of his kingdom.

The growth of the new Church, like that of the American people, was surprising. By the blessing of God it soon attracted to itself a larger body of adherents than any other in the nation. Its missions spread into every continent, and their growth has been a joy to the Christian world. The explanation of this extraordinary progress must be sought in a variety of considerations. Priority of organization as respects other autonomous connectional American communions was, of course, one advantage; greater ones, however, were the Church's earnestly evangelistic spirit, its peculiarities of organization, its directness of doctrinal statement, and its friendliness of attitude toward other Christians of every name. It has always and every-where endeavored first of all to seek and to save the lost. It has always believed and taught that the sole infallible proof of the legitimacy of any particular branch of the Christian Church is to be found in its currently proven ability to transmit and propagate that pentecostal spirit and life procured for mankind in and through the Founder of the Church, the incarnate Son of God. It has ever recognized as true branches

of Christ's Church all that clearly demonstrate their power by the word and Spirit of God to renew men in the divine image. It has ever laid chief stress upon the essentials of religion, not upon forms. Its spirit has been unusually liberal, its terms of fellowship comprehensive. Probationary membership has ever been open to men of all opinions. Among the debated forms of baptism this Church has left to every candidate the fullest freedom of choice. If any member has had scruple against receiving the Lord's Supper kneeling he has been permitted to receive it standing or sitting. In all ordinary public worship the people have been invited to unite in extemporary prayers; yet on sacramental occasions, and in all services connected with the ordination of the ministry, the dedication of houses of worship, the solemnization of matrimony, and the burial of the dead, a stately ritual embodying the best material from the most ancient sources has been employed. In its Hymnal the voices of all Christian Churches and of all Christian ages harmoniously unite. To the spiritually minded Romanist it offers a communion holy, catholic, and apostolic; to the believer in episcopacy an administration by godly bishops; to the advocate of Presbyterianism legislation by representative presbyters and laymen; to the champion of Congregationalism local independence in the discipline of members, in the licensing of preachers, and in all questions relative to the sustentation of public worship. Its very structure is thus preclusive of every narrow and partisan spirit, its life a school of truest catholicity. That it might ever remain worthy of its origin, and ever more and more fruitfully fulfill its divine calling as a leader in evangelization, a pioneer in all true reforms, a pattern in all charities, a power for the promotion of fraternal relations among all branches of the one true Church of Jesus Christ, has been the prayer of our ministers and members from the beginning until now. For these ends will we and our children continue to labor and cease not to pray.

*William F. Warren.*

## ART. VI.—PERSONALITY IN AUTHORSHIP.

SOMETIME since a body of scholarly men was entertained on the subject of "Homer" by a gentleman of rare powers and keen sensibilities. The conclusion of the address was that the *Iliad* was immortalized by the exalted moral purpose pervading it and wrought out in the course of the narrative. Interesting as was this suggestion, and seductive as was the argument, we could not but dissent. The chief reason for this lack of concurrence lay in the conviction that the heart-qualities of the author had been entirely overlooked, while whatever of morality the poem contained seemed to be attributed to a distinct purpose on the part of the bard to awaken a particular sentiment in the minds of his audience. It is but fair, however, to state that the writing of this article is only indirectly due to the address in question, and that it makes mention of it merely as having formed the nucleus round which were gathered the following observations. Whatever interest may attach to the present writing must arise from the fact that such criticism is quite universal, false though its method would appear to be. To others, our own method may seem insufficient, and without force in its application.

In respect of morality-teaching in literature there exists, perhaps, a greater variety of methods, although for present purposes it will suffice to make mention of but two; the first being that which, setting out with a view solely to propound or illustrate moral truths, seeks to establish them as guides to human action; the other, that which not purposely, but naturally, brings to light some eternal verity having the power to impress the reader as an unintentional sermon. It will depend largely upon the habits, temperament, and proclivities of the individual—in a word, upon his character—whether the effect upon him of the former will exceed that of the latter. Laxly speaking, we ordinarily attribute the result of the latter class to the nature of the subject-matter, thinking it necessary that certain impressions should be consequent upon the observation of given occurrences. That this view is unphilosophical and in its very essence untrue is sufficiently illustrated not only in our every-day lives by the effective homilies our neighbor gleans from current events while we, perhaps, behold them with moral indifference, but



especially and notably in the divergence existing between the modern schools of historiography.

It is a fact patent to every observer that events often occur in certain sequence. But what conclusion are we thence to draw? One historian finds in this phenomenon but a manifestation of the progress of causation, such as is observed in material nature. Is not man, with his individual acts, the unit of history, inasmuch as it is the collective activity of these elements that produces the *ensemble*? But men are prompted by different motives, each of which results in a specific policy. Another historian, admitting that these atoms are ultimate, but holding them subject to and dependent upon their surroundings, will add that the possible motives in the individual, and consequently the courses of action, are not infinite, but are in fact reduced in number to a minimum by his environment. Such reflections will lead the investigator to a consideration of the climatic relations of a country and the resultant constitution of its population. This, however, is not the only stand-point from which we may survey history, that vast net-work of fatality following night and day upon the cyclings of the sun, making unalterable the works of men and holding them firmly as in the gripe of death. In contemplating this august spectacle we find laws obtaining the same as those ruling in our consciousness; and in the retributions and rewards of history we divine the dominance of a moral Providence. Thus is the process reversed. But to us it seems clear that both these views are true, though one leads the eye earthward, the other heavenward. They are supplementary rather than diverse. Yet such are the various constitutions of men that even within this sphere, so sensibly retrenched, scarce two will hit upon the same reflections.

It ought, therefore, to be evident that something much more fundamental than intellectual purpose and perception must be sought out as the ground of difference. Let not the import of this assertion be misconceived. There is no need to deny that according to the former of the methods designated a preacher, for example, may have a certain end in view in making choice of a text. This is no doubt frequently the case; would it were always true! Yet there is room for much originality as well as for the display of the complete character. Supposing even the preacher has chosen his text as well as his

materials, he will needs show his personality in some way. Commonly he does it by proving from the start that there is nothing original either in the subject-matter or in the complexion of his sermon. Beneath the time-honored accumulations of the commentary he hides himself only to prove his intellectual nonentity. If, however, he read the Scriptures and choose from them text and illustration at first hand, he must inevitably exhibit his point of view, which coincides with his character. The person who is actually original presents his subject in the light in which it appears to *him*; and once this point given the convergence of rays will prove the whereabouts of the *man*. Of course, there is no standard in heaven or on earth by which we can measure one who is not original, save that of honesty. Honesty, to be sure, may consist in very different things. One lacking originality may be perfectly honest in giving credit to his authorities and to those from whom he has borrowed, while ever concealing his own, perhaps repulsive, character in the comely vestment of another's heart. On the other hand, he may be in perfect sympathy with the sentiments of another and yet fail to respect his authorship. In either case the writer will lack honesty, and a further inquiry into his character will prove to be of no advantage.

That the factor of personality is of vast and perhaps paramount importance in criticism seems not to be fully recognized, although biographers have instinctively turned to this source in their quest of materials suited to their uses. The rationalistic spirit, in a strangely perverted form, has thus far prevailed in literary criticism. The public mind has somehow become possessed of the idea that an author has always some great lesson to teach—the greater, perchance, because he dares not print it boldly, but must write it in cipher. In response to this sentiment has arisen among writers of fiction the erratic belief that they must publish at the least one novel on some question of the day. As a rule these productions, which purposely embody just those elements which the critic seeks to ferret out in all his reading, are among the most puerile and ephemeral. A good book is the life-blood of an author, was the judgment of Milton. It is the Mrs. Stowe who weeps for anguish when one of her literary characters dies, not the preacher who chuckles over a “good hit” that will live to posterity. The best things

penned, those which will continue ever to impress and influence mankind, were reality to the writer—were beliefs, not conceits or perceptions. They act upon the mind as some passages of Wagner's music, in which the air seems swallowed up in the concord; the effect apparently intended is lost in the suggestion of a something inexpressible beyond.

We all, perhaps, have heard admirable sermons whose substance lay in a parallel drawn by the preacher between some historical narrative in the Scriptures and the facts of our daily lives. He evidently believed his interpretation of the passage to be the one intended by its author, while we could perceive no such intent in the records. He seemed not to remark that in so allegorizing the account he might awaken in the minds of some a doubt as to its historical value. Yet we loved the man for the character he displayed, so delicately attuned, as it were, to the moral verities of the universe that the very stones proclaimed to him in voices well-nigh articulate the unchanging purposes of God. We could not, indeed, but feel that the chambers of his heart had given back to the original words a multiplied response, the source of whose reverberations he had mistaken. We appear, at times, to forget that we are so intimately in touch with every thing in nature that she speaks to us her various languages. It is in the suggestiveness of the things about us that we come to learn our participation in their being, above them though we be. On the other hand, we frequently ascend by way of analogy from mental and moral facts of consciousness to a possible explanation of things beyond the reach of proof.

Analyze, if you will, the grounds on which rests your belief in the trustworthiness of the moral sentiments expressed in any book of sacred Scripture, and you will find that ultimately it is faith in the *character* of the author, whether human or divine. It certainly is not faith in his knowledge of the truth, nor yet in his desire to teach such and such doctrines. These are factors the value of which must be determined; but finally it is character that we are most concerned about. The greatest variance of opinion in other matters is consistent with agreement in this. The heart of the Christian would concede every thing else before it would yield its trust in the integrity of those upon whose words his anchor holds. The same general

thought is applicable in other spheres. "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good," say the Scriptures. Isaac Disraeli has gone a step further in declaring: "A virtuous writer communicates virtue; a refined writer subtile delicacy; a sublime writer an elevation of sentiment." Nor need this be accomplished by the use of italics or of other means of making these qualities conspicuous. He is, indeed, an unsympathetic reader who does not learn as much of the author as he does of the book.

But not only in this light is the truth reflected. Turn to the grand masters and inquire whether they wrote for the effect, or whether it was not rather a *fact* they sought to embody in a form essentially their own. Shakespeare's "Julius Cæsar" grandly illustrates the awful and particular retributions of Providence. Brutus has so noble a heart we cannot but sigh for his folly. We wish he had been wise as he was good; yet it is impossible he should live. It is as though the conspirators had hewn down Atlas and the heavens were descending in ruin. We cannot imagine our grand poet as sitting down to evolve that plot from out his brain. It is clearly the reaction of his personality after the irresistible impression which the historical narrative made upon him. In fact, it is the distinctive mark of all high tragedy, as of all grand opera, that the effect upon the mind is overpowering, and leaves behind the sense of having beheld the soul of a seer in travail.

Why is it that the tragic trilogies of the Greek poets are so distinct in character, despite the fact that the plot was mostly delivered ready to their hand in the native mythology? The devout religionism of Æschylus and the Tyche-worship of Sophocles produced other fruits than the sophism of Euripides. The heart-rending agony of Orestes in the Eumenides, as the furies pursue him even into the sanctuary, and then the intervention of the god, so necessary to allay our distress, raise the story high above the low and vulgar plane of possible stage trickery. As we read we realize that we are in the presence of a spirit that believes in the appearance of gods on earth. In order to a comprehension of the sublime visions of Sophocles and the religious narrative of Herodotus, one must learn to appreciate the awe in which they held the irresistible and inscrutable jealousy of Fortune. To them, that "Pride goeth

before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall," was a reality, not a truthful moral to preach. The irony of Tyche haunted them like a specter, and in the fate of Œdipus and of Polyrates they held up to their compatriots an illustration of the caprice of her whom they all feared.

No more striking instance of the conversion of an author's personality into literature can be found than in Goethe's *Faust*. Perhaps there is no trait in the one which does not have its counterpart in the other. It is the face as against its reflection in a mirror. The self-portraiture is as evident as in *Childe Harold*. Among the Germans only one other has left us a self-portrait drawn with equal truthfulness. It was Schleiermacher in his *Monologues*. But this latter is more amiable, more exalting. Of the many motives capable of inciting the human heart to aspire to perfection none has failed of representation. We seem to see his great soul expanding more and more, reaching forth its fingers of desire to grapple with the mysteries that now oppress us. Of the French the *Journal* of Amiel alone offers such an insight into his nature as to leave us satisfied of its completeness. A retiring heart was his, almost refraining from speaking within its own hearing, but finally revealing its sweetness and warmth to the pages of his *Journal*. It is in the contemplation of these great natures, self-revealed, and of the souls ever yearning for expression as if conscious of their invisibility, that one gains that love of heart-nobility which must ever afterward supply a new and powerful motive in one's efforts at self-advancement. The full intent of the line,

"The proper study of mankind is man,"

will perhaps be never known; but we all have, doubtless, experienced the sense of exaltation naturally ensuing when, through the chink of word or deed, we catch a momentary glimpse of the sanctuary of a manly mind.

The same is true, of course, in proportionate degree, of the inferior classes of literature. It is of the novel that one would here most naturally speak. Certainly not of that exceptional kind which, like *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, are epics in prose, and are as truly the product of a country's yearning and genius as were those of Homer. Their subjects are before all men's eyes, and the universal heart responds to them however weakly,

until there is one too much moved for silence. The spontaneous acclaim of a people on hearing the word bears witness to the futile, half-instinctive efforts of a million breasts to lend it utterance. Such works are inferior to none, and are to be classed with earth's best. But there are others which possess not so much human interest, and are produced with a view to entertaining. There is no better reason for their being frivolous than for our daily conversations. Their character will depend upon that of their author. Given a plot of human love with characters far from saintly, it is quite possible to transfigure the scene in the light of ennobling sentiments emanating from the writer's heart. Indeed, one is tempted to say that, as in the case of Dante, with a proper guide there can be no contamination in the contemplation even of hell. In writing thus Mrs. Phelps-Ward's *Jack* recurs as a benediction to our mind.

Of such significance is the factor of personality in this department of literature as not to be easily overstated. It is quite conceivable, as being a fact well established, that corrupt and unscrupulous men should be able to produce a sermon apparently imbued with all the unction of a saint. The evident design of the effort offers the explanation. A bad character may deem it politic to pose as a model of goodness, and certain expressions and attitudes of the virtuous are but too easily counterfeited. Given a definite aim, human nature is so constituted that it can for a time assume in appearance the virtues desirable to display. The same risk is run in every species of literature in which the personality of the writer is the model as well as the pigment reckoned on for the production of color. Notably is this the case in lyric poetry, the soul of which, indeed, is truthfulness; but, alas! frequently even life itself is imitated. In both these instances it is the form rather than the substance of the thought that reveals the character of the author, inasmuch as here, at least, the mind is abandoned to its own resources, and is obliged to represent notions in the shades they assume in passing before its tribunal. But for the personality in perfect dishabille we must look among that class of writers who forget themselves and their beliefs in the representation of things as they see them. This is the vocation of the novelist. Instead of telling his fellows what they should do



he undertakes to picture for them the world as it is. Fortunately, he can sketch his subject only from personal observation, or according to principles become a part of his own nature. Otherwise he loses the secret of life, and the product of his labors passes into merited oblivion. What will he see? What will be the image reflected in his works? Just as every variously formed lens will affect a refraction peculiar to itself, so the medium of observation must leave unmistakable traces of its constitution in the complexion of the portrait attained. Analyze the picture, and you may determine the nature of the lens. It is a matter of greatest moment that the views of life we introduce into our homes should be true, and taken from the vantage-ground of a pure, ennobling mind.

In the case of the great historians and critics the mistake is commonly made of attributing their exceptional point of view to breadth of intellectual grasp. Nothing could be more erroneous. The intellect alone, keen though it may be, can never transmute its materials into the semblance of a sublime creation. Ideals perform that lofty function, and they emanate, not from the brain, but from the heart. There is, indeed, no intrinsic necessity in accordance with which we might with certainty draw the conclusion of a spherically perfected character from the existence of lofty ideals; but we may be sure the heart-power which has builded such highways for the course of thought has put to rout many a degrading vice. Nor does there exist any well-founded doubt but that it is the point of view that determines at once the value and the perpetuity of literature. Review Macaulay, Guizot, Ranke, and Quinet, and you must readily agree it is not so much their unexampled acquaintance with their subjects as the depth of their sympathies and the height of their ideals that have rendered these historians immortal. Knowledge is of little worth until transfused into that volatile, aspiring substance we call genius when directed by the power of ideals. And it would seem as if this might have been the import of the Socratic doctrine, that knowledge is the basis of morality; for surely nothing could be more inspiring as well as sustaining in one's striving after perfection than the possession of this same power. On the other hand, no suggestion so well accounts for the persistence of fame as that which discovers its secret



in the immanence of a personality worthy of undiminished existence.

To criticism this conclusion should be of importance as offering a criterion by which the worth of literature may be rated. This, of course, does not comprise all species of writing, inasmuch as there is much of even permanent value written that does not really belong to its domain. We find such instances in the various sciences, where, if it be objectively presented, the author is completely merged in his theme. A book may have sufficient significance to found a new department of knowledge without in the least pertaining to literature. In fact, in exact proportion as the writer is truly scientific or objective in the handling of his materials he recedes from the literary stand-point, which is subjective. Hence arises the difficulty of assigning to philosophy its appropriate place. In so far as it is objective in method it remains but a part of science, passing into the realm of letters so soon as it takes the author's self as the starting-point. But as his personality is irrepressible he continually transgresses the proper bounds, thus vitiating much acute philosophy while adding interesting studies to the bulk of literature. We should, therefore, beware of applying this standard to productions without, although it rules supreme within its sphere.

To revert, then, to the point of departure, it was with a feeling that justice had not been done to Homer that we heard his immortality attributed to a design on his part rather than to his character. Not to insist upon the circumstance that such a purpose can be revealed only by means of a questionable cipher, the fact of the bard's undying fame seemed to require a deeper-lying cause. We have pointed out that the morality of one's writings, as truly as of one's actions, is more commonly traceable to the personality than to any distinct design, and have thus discovered the seat of the greatest strength and vitality either man or letters may possess. Character, individuality, and personality are so intimately knit together that they appear to embrace the principle of life, with which they apparently are indissolubly one. Existence, therefore, in literature, no less than in man, depends, it would appear, upon the indwelling of this trinity.

*W. Arthur Hirdel*

## ART. VII.—WESLEY AS A SCIENTIST.

THROUGHOUT the centennial year of John Wesley's death there have appeared in different church periodicals a series of papers descriptive of some of his more prominent characteristics. It shall be the object of the present undertaking to study Wesley as a scientific writer. It may be a surprise to many to learn that he turned from his work of evangelizing the world long enough to even notice scientific subjects. As a matter of fact, the writer is embarrassed in an effort to present in the limits of a single paper the baldest outlines of his expressions of belief and opinions upon scientific topics.

When Wesley took the whole world as his parish he did so in more senses than one, and within this all-embracing parish there arose no problems which he did not in his own way attempt to solve. It will be no surprise, therefore, to those who are familiar with the inflexible will with which he settled, so far as he was concerned, all theological questions, to find that he treated astronomy, geology, and medicine *ex cathedra* also.

Wherever the length of the quotations does not preclude their insertion in full Wesley's own words will be given.

## ETERNITY.

It is so vast that the narrow mind of man is utterly unable to comprehend it. But does it not bear some affinity to another incomprehensible thing, immensity? May not space, though an unsubstantial thing, be compared with another unsubstantial thing, duration? But what is immensity? It is boundless space. And what is eternity? It is boundless duration.\*

## TIME.

We know not what it properly is; we cannot well tell how to define it. But is it not, in some sense, a fragment of eternity, broken off at both ends? †

These definitions of time and eternity, while not strictly scientific, yet are as accurate as science can well make them, and that of time is of such daring and beauty that, once heard, it can never be forgotten.

## THE ETERNITY OF MATTER.

All matter, indeed, is continually changing, and that into ten thousand forms; but that it is changeable does in no wise imply

\* Sermon on *Eternity*, paragraph 1.

† *Ibid.*, paragraph 4.

that it is perishable. The substance may remain one and the same, though under innumerable different forms. It is very possible any portion of matter may be resolved into the atoms of which it was originally composed; but what reason have we to believe that one of these atoms ever was or ever will be annihilated? . . . Yea, by this [fire] "the heavens themselves will be dissolved; the elements shall melt with fervent heat." But they will be only dissolved, not destroyed; they will melt, but they will not perish. Though they lose their present form, yet not a particle of them will ever lose its existence; but every atom of them will remain under one form or other to all eternity.\*

Such words as these, written over a hundred years ago, would not be out of place in a modern work on conservation of energy.

#### THE CREATION.

He first created the four elements out of which the whole universe was composed—earth, water, air, and fire, all mingled together in one common mass. The greater part of this—the earth and water—were utterly without form till God infused a principle of motion, commanding the air to move "upon the face of the waters." In the next place "the Lord God said, Let there be light: and there was light." Here were the four constituent parts of the universe, the true, original, simple elements. They were all essentially distinct from each other; and yet so intimately mixed together in all compound bodies that we cannot find any, be it ever so minute, which does not contain them all.†

This earth, air, fire, and water notion of the elementary structure of the universe was the ancient one, but long before Wesley's day more correct ideas had begun to prevail. In fact, in his own times Black, Cavendish, and Priestley, in England, and Lavoisier and Scheele, on the Continent, were publishing the result of their experiments, out of which came modern chemistry.

Throughout the remainder of this sermon Wesley assumes that the universe bore quite a different aspect when first created for innocent man to what it became after the fall of Adam: that when sin entered into the world it brought with it such sweeping changes in the appearance and processes of nature as to practically result in a re-creation.

Since God pronounced that all "was good" Wesley assumed

\* Sermon on *Eternity*, paragraph 7.

† *God's Approbation of His Works*, paragraph 1.

that every thing was good according to his own ideas of perfection, after the following manner :

And every part was fertile as well as beautiful; it was no way deformed by rough or ragged rocks, it did not shock the view with horrid precipices, huge chasms, or dreary caverns; with deep impassable morasses or deserts of barren sand.\*

After having smoothed out the wrinkles of the original earth until it threatened to become as even as the top of a bald head, we are pleased to discover that he leaves us some phrenological bumps in the way of hills and probably mountains, but these he concedes on the condition that they must not be abrupt or difficult of ascent. "It is highly probable that they rose and fell by almost insensible degrees."

As the exterior, so was likewise the interior of the earth, in most perfect order and harmony.

Hence there were no agitations within the bowels of the globe, no violent convulsions, no concussions of the earth, no earthquakes; but all was unmoved as the pillars of heaven. There were then no such things as eruptions of fire; there were no volcanoes or burning mountains.†

Since we learn from this that Vesuvius and Etna are younger than the human race, we are left to the alternative of believing that they are less than six thousand years old, or that the creation of man must be pushed backward through vast periods into the geological past.

The element of water, it is probable, was then mostly confined within the great abyss. Hence it is probable there was no external sea in the paradisaical earth; none until the great deep burst the barriers which were originally appointed for it. Indeed, there was not then that need of the ocean for navigation which there is now; for either every country produced whatever was requisite either for the necessity or comfort of its inhabitants, or man, being then (as he will be again at the resurrection) equal to angels, was made able to convey himself at his pleasure to any given distance. But whether there was sea or not, there were rivers sufficient to water the earth and make it very plenteous. But there were no putrid lakes, no turbid or stagnating waters.‡

Surely no one could be accused of being overcurious should he ask, Since there were no seas, no putrid lakes, no stagnating waters, into what could the waters have emptied?

\* *God's Approbation of His Works*, par. 2.

† *Ibid.*, par. 3.

‡ *Ibid.*, par. 4.

The sun, the fountain of fire,

Of this great world both eye and soul,

was situated at the most exact distance from the earth, so as to yield a sufficient quantity of heat (neither too little nor too much) to every part of it. God had not yet

Bid his angels turn askance  
This oblique globe.

There was therefore then no country that groaned under "the rage of Aretos and eternal frost." There was no violent winter, no sultry summer; no extreme, either of heat or cold. No soil was burnt up by the solar heat; none uninhabitable through the want of it.\*

For there were then no impetuous currents of air, no tempestuous winds, no furious hail, no torrents of rain, no rolling thunders or forked lightnings. One perennial spring was perpetually smiling over the whole surface of the earth. On the third day God commanded all kinds of vegetables to spring out of the earth. . . . Some of these were adapted to particular climates or particular exposures; while vegetables of more general use (as wheat in particular) were not confined to one country, but would flourish almost in every climate."†

Here Wesley was evidently entangled in the meshes of his speculations, for since the "sun was at the most exact distance from the earth, so as to yield a sufficient quantity of heat to every part of it," and there was one perennial spring, there could be no particular climate or exposures in which the vegetables were to flourish in every climate.

Whether comets are to be numbered among the stars, and whether they were parts of the original creation, is perhaps not so easily determined, at least with certainty; as we have nothing but probable conjecture either concerning their nature or their use. We know not whether (as some ingenious men have imagined) they are ruined worlds—worlds that have undergone a general conflagration—or whether (as others not improbably suppose) they are immense reservoirs of fluids, appointed to revolve at certain seasons and to supply the still decreasing moisture of the earth. But certain we are that they did not either produce or portend any evil. They did not (as many have fancied since)

From their horrid hair  
Shake pestilence and war.‡

We should be glad to credit Wesley with the belief that comets did at no time portend evil, instead of during the continuance of the original creation only, when there was no evil to

\* *God's Approbation of His Works*, par. 6. † *Ibid.*, par. 9. ‡ *Ibid.*, par. 10.

portend. But that he looked with evident misgivings and suspicion upon these mysterious heavenly visitors we learn from a passage in his sermon on the "New Creation," where, in speaking of the rehabilitation of the earth for Christ's second coming, he declares, "There will be no blazing stars or comets there. Whether those horrid, eccentric orbs are half-formed planets in a chaotic state, or such as have undergone their general conflagration, they will certainly have no place in the new heaven, where all will be exact order and harmony."

#### THE CREATION OF LIFE.

The Lord God afterward peopled the earth with animals of every kind. He first commanded the waters to bring forth abundantly: to bring forth creatures which, as they inhabited a grosser element, so they were in general of a stupid nature, endowed with fewer senses and less understanding than other animals.\* It seems the insect kinds were at least one degree above the inhabitants of the waters.† But, in general, the birds created to fly in the open firmament of heaven appear to have been of an order far superior to either insects or reptiles, although still considerably inferior to beasts.‡ However, none of the fishes then attempted to devour, or in any wise hurt one another. . . . The spider was then as harmless as the fly, and then did not lie in wait for blood. . . . Meantime the reptiles of every kind were equally harmless and more intelligent than they. . . . But among all these there were no birds or beasts of prey; none that destroyed or molested another.

What a tame world Adam must have found it when the spiders, the crocodiles, and the tigers ate grass!

Such was the state of creation according to the scant ideas which we can now form concerning it when its great Author, surveying the whole system at one view, pronounced it "very good."§

From the above picture, as presented in his own words, no one can say that Wesley's ideas were scanty, for it is one of the most minute and particular descriptions of creation to be found in literature.

But what an infinity of degree separates the words of man from those of God. On the one hand is the cosmogony of the intellectual Wesley, which, after the lapse of a single century, have become antiquated and ludicrous, while that of Genesis,

\* *God's Approbation of His Works*, par. 11.

† *Ibid.*, par. 13.

‡ *Ibid.*, par. 12.

§ *Ibid.*, par. 14.

after the brunt of thousands of years, stands as perennially fresh and unimpeachable as truth itself!

These speculations of Wesley were so out of keeping with his well-known practical and non-speculative mind that the present writer was at a loss to account for them until he recollected an old book which he had met with in some investigations of a few years ago. A re-examination of this book made all clear.

Dr. Thomas Burnet, an able English writer and scholar, published in 1680 the Latin edition, and in 1691 the English translation, of a work entitled *The Sacred Theory of the Earth*, which attracted considerable attention at that day.

It purported to be a description of the original earth, with all the changes which have taken place since. This work was utterly worthless as science, but abounded in eloquent and sublime passages which made it much sought after and read. A single quotation from this book will make it no longer possible to doubt where Wesley obtained his science.

In this smooth earth were the first scenes of the world and the first generations of mankind; it had the beauty of youth and blooming nature, fresh and fruitful, and not a wrinkle, scar, or fracture in all its body; no rocks nor mountains, no hollow caves nor gaping channels, but even and uniform all over. And the smoothness of the earth made the face of the heavens so too; the air was calm and serene; none of those tumultuary motions and conflicts of vapors which the mountains and the winds cause in ours. 'Twas suited to a golden age and to the first innocence of nature.

Had there been no other but such works on science as this of Burnet no criticism could be made because Wesley used and adopted it, for it cannot be expected of any man to know more than the current knowledge of his age. But, not speaking of the widely published labors of his contemporaries in England, as Black, Cavendish, and Priestley, in chemistry, and Hutton, in geology, there was published in the same year with that of Burnet's a treatise by John Ray, a man as devout as he was eminent in science, entitled *The Wisdom of God as Manifested in the Works of the Creation*, from which Paley drew his inspiration and many of the most important arguments and illustrations for his *Natural Theology*.

To come across in this same sermon of Wesley a passage of



such modern sound as the following makes one almost forget the crudities in which it was buried :

There was "a golden chain," to use the expression of Plato, "let down from the throne of God;" an exactly connected series of beings, from the highest to the lowest; from dead earth, through fossils, vegetables, animals, to man, created in the image of God, and designed to know, to love, and to enjoy his Creator to all eternity.\*

No clearer statement of theistic evolution can be found in the writings of John Fiske, Winchell, or Le Conte.

#### PLURALITY OF WORLDS.

On the question of other inhabited worlds besides our own Wesley speaks with admirable discernment. He says :

But the more I consider that supposition the more I doubt it. Inasmuch that if it were allowed by all the philosophers in Europe, still I could not allow it without stronger proof than any I have met with yet.

When the adherents of this belief brought forward the statement of the astronomer Huygens, that the moon, when viewed through a good telescope, displayed "rivers and mountains on her spotted globe," and argued that where rivers are there are also plants, and where vegetation is there is also animal life, even man; that if the moon be inhabited so we may easily suppose are the moons of Jupiter and Saturn; that if these are inhabited why should we doubt it of the planets themselves, Wesley, like the general he was, turned their own guns upon his adversaries by asking :

But do you not know that Mr. Huygens himself, before he died, doubted of this whole hypothesis? For, upon further observation, he found reason to believe that the moon has no atmosphere; . . . consequently it has no clouds, no rain, no springs, no rivers, and, therefore, no plants or animals. But there is no proof or probability that the moon is inhabited; neither have we any proof that the other planets are. Consequently, the foundation being removed, the whole fabric falls to the ground.†

A man possessing such accurate scientific insight as to be enabled to reason thus ought never to have held the cosmogony he did.

\* *God's Approbation of His Works*, paragraph 14.

† *What is Man?* paragraphs 8-11.

## SLEEP.

In a sermon "On Redeeming the Time" Wesley condemns Bishop Taylor for fixing the measure of sleep necessary at the general standard of only three hours in the twenty-four, also that of Mr. Baxter, who supposes four enough, and even that of an "extremely sensible man" of his acquaintance who was persuaded that five hours was enough for any man living, but who, Wesley observes, when he made the experiment himself, quickly relinquished the opinion. Wesley considered six hours for men and seven for women as a fair standard, although he wisely makes provision for exceptions to the rule, confessing that he himself cannot well subsist with less than six and a half.

Modern authorities would prefer to add an hour and a half to Wesley's own time as the average period required for sleep.

It is, indeed, surprising that he, with an originally frail constitution, with repeated attacks of pleurisy and probably incipient phthisis, could have carried on the almost incredible amount of work, physical and mental, which he performed for sixty years with six and a half hours' sleep in the twenty-four. Of course, his regular and frugal habits, freedom from worry, his life in the saddle, and correct methods of public speaking were all important factors in his life.

One of the evils of oversleeping he considered *weakness of sight*, particularly of the nervous kind.

When I was young my sight was remarkably weak. Why, it is stronger now than it was forty years ago! I impute this principally to the blessing of God, who fits us for whatever he calls us to. But, undoubtedly, the outward means by which he has been pleased to bless was early rising in the morning.

Had Wesley consulted an oculist he most probably would have been found to be suffering from near-sightedness, which decreases as one gets older.

Another of the evils of oversleeping is, that it lays the foundation of many diseases. "It is the chief (though unsuspected) cause of all nervous diseases in particular."

According to this the modern rest-cure for nervous diseases would hardly have received approbation from him. We, who have been led to believe that nervous disorders are the product of the high pressure of this latter end of the nine-

teenth century, are somewhat surprised to find Wesley use these words:

Many inquiries have been made why nervous disorders are so much more common among us than among our ancestors? Other causes may occur, but the chief is, we lie longer in bed. Instead of rising at four, most of us who are not obliged to work for our bread lie till seven, eight, or nine. We need inquire no further. This sufficiently accounts for the large increase of these painful disorders.\*

As if this scientific writing was not enough, Wesley, in the year 1747, published a treatise on medicine, entitled *Primitive Physic*, which, after extended use in England by the Methodists, was followed by an American edition under the auspices of Coke and Asbury.

This book consists of an alphabetically arranged list of diseases, with a short description of the chief symptoms, followed by several prescriptions designed for cure.

Many of these are the ordinary prescriptions of that day, as may be found by referring to contemporary medical works, but by far the greater part are of domestic recipes of the crudest kind, even for that date. It will be interesting to examine a few of them:

3. *St. Anthony's Fire (Erysipelas)*.—Take a glass of tar-water warm, in bed, every hour, washing the part in the same.

6. *The Asthma*.—Live a fortnight on boiled carrots only. It seldom fails.

14. *Blisters* on the feet, occasioned by walking, are cured by drawing a needleful of worsted through them; clip it off at both ends and leave it till the skin peels off.

There is no better treatment than this at the present time.

24. *Children*.—To prevent the rickets, tenderness, and weakness, dip them in cold water every morning, at least till they are eight or nine months old.

Few mothers and fewer physicians would like to venture on this plan of hardening their children at such a tender age.

Let them go barefooted and bareheaded till they are four years old at least.

It is a fact that, if fashion would allow our children to live in this primitive manner, there would be less catarrh, croup,

\* *What is Man?* paragraph 4.

and pneumonia among children. Indeed, throughout the rural districts of our Southern States it is common to see children who have had or are inclined to croup allowed to go barefooted for a year or so, and with almost universal benefit.

25. *Chin-cough or Whooping-cough*.—Rub the back at lying down with old rum.

Whooping-cough must have been of a different sort to the modern form to have been frightened away at so simple an attack.

41. *Windy Colic*.—Parched peas, eaten freely, have had the most happy effects when all other means have failed.

Is it to be presumed that these act upon the principle of *similia similibus curantur*?

43. *Consumption*.—One in a deep consumption was advised to drink nothing but water and eat nothing but water-gruel, without salt or sugar. In three months' time he was perfectly well.

For one suffering from any disease, not to speak of consumption, to have lived three months on this regimen, and to be perfectly well at the expiration of that time, was indeed remarkable.

Or, every morning cut up a little turf of fresh earth, and, lying down, breath into the hole for a quarter of an hour. I have known a deep consumption cured thus.

49. *Costiveness*.—Rise early every morning.

52. *The Cramp*.—To one ounce and a half of spirits of turpentine add flour of brimstone and sulphur vivum, of each half an ounce; smell this at night three or four times.

This is somewhat after the method of Hahnemann, for no inconsiderable part of Hahnemann's *Organon* is devoted to the treatment of certain diseases by the smelling of his highly diluted drugs.

Or hold a roll of brimstone in your hand. I have frequently done this with success.

71. *Eyes Inflamed*.—Poultice of roasted or rotten apples will relieve, but white bread poultices will frequently occasion blindness.

87. *Extreme Fat*.—Use a totally vegetable diet. I know one who was entirely cured of this by living a year thus; she breakfasted and supped on milk and water with bread, and dined on turnips, carrots, or other roots, drinking water.

88. *A Fever*.—In the beginning of any fever, if the stomach is uneasy, vomit; if the bowels, purge.

This recalls the story of the naval surgeon who, when a sailor became sick, tied a cord around the patient's waist and inquired whether his pain was above the cord or below it. If above, an emetic was administered; if below, a cathartic. In this way he never had any cases difficult to diagnose.

92. *A Slow Fever*.—Use the cold bath for two or three weeks daily.

This is practically the same as the modern and highly successful treatment which has been recently adopted at many of our hospitals.

130. *Lethargy*.—Snuff strong vinegar up the nose.

If a man snuffs strong vinegar up his nose he will not suffer from lethargy for a while; that is certain.

134. *Lunacy*.—Take daily an ounce of distilled vinegar, or electrify.

134. *Raging Madness*.—Let him eat nothing but apples for a month.

It will be safe to guarantee, in this case, that before the month has expired the raging madness will have ceased.

136. *The Bite of a Mad Dog*.—Plunge into cold water daily for twenty days, and keep as long under it as possible. This has cured even after hydrophobia was begun.

If the patient is kept under the water long enough it will cure every case.

137. *The Measles*.—Immediately consult an honest physician.

This is the only place but one in his whole book where he insists upon a physician being immediately called. He gives treatment with utmost composure to such trifling disorders as diphtheria, small-pox, erysipelas, poisoning, madness, and hydrophobia without a suggestion of a physician's assistance, but he evidently draws the line at measles.

146. *Old Age*.—Take tar-water morning and evening.

This water is more easily obtained than that which Ponce de Leon sought in Florida.

168. *To Restore Strength after Rheumatism*.—Make a strong broth of cow-heels and wash the parts with it twice a day. It has restored one who was quite a cripple, having no strength left in his leg, thigh, or loins.

179. *Shingles*.—Drink sea-water every morning.

190. *Putrid Sore Throat (Diphtheria)*.—Lay on the tongue a lump of sugar dipped in brandy.

204. *Stone (to prevent)*.—Eat a crust of dry bread every morning.

234. *The Vertigo*.—In a May morning, about sunrise, snuff up daily the dew that is on the mallow-leaves.

258. *Worms*.—Bruising the green leaves of bear's-foot, and smelling often of them, sometimes expels worms.

Hahnemann again. It may become some day a question in medical history whether Wesley was not the original homeopathist. At one period of his life Hahnemann subsisted by translating Latin, English, and French works into German, and he himself states that he got his first idea of his theory of *similia* while translating, in 1790, Cullen's *Treatise on Materia Medica*. Who knows but he may have seen Wesley's *Primitive Physic*, which was published forty years before this date?

Had Wesley contented himself with compiling a treatise from the authorities of his day they, and not he, would have been accountable for the aptness of the treatment recommended, but when he chose to differ from the faculty at almost every point he rendered himself liable to be judged by the common standard. Nor can it be successfully urged that, as a busy clergyman, he was not familiar with, nor could be expected to be familiar with, the scientific thought of the day; but we have the best evidence that he made it his business to inform himself with this branch of knowledge.

According to the strict methods with which he regulated his life in every matter he gave a part of one day in every week to the study of natural philosophy and allied scientific studies. He found time to perform experiments in optics, and was familiar with the works of Euclid, Keill, Newton, and Huygens. Busy as he was in his evangelical labors Wesley kept himself in touch with all the knowledge of his day. So that, familiar with them all, he deliberately chose John Hutchinson in preference to Isaac Newton, Burnet to Hutton, and old wives to Cullen and Sydenham.

W. C. Cahall.

## ART. VIII.—THEISM—A BRIEF STUDY.

A POSTULATE of any knowledge is a thinking mind and an object of thought. Primarily the process involves the opening of one's mental eyes upon an existent world. That world may exist within or without, or both within and without. Hence, it may or may not have material existence. As a matter of fact, every object of thought dwells in the mind in immaterial form, though material existence—perhaps, indeed, all existence—has a material outline, either real or conceived. Thought cannot dwell upon nothing, and every something must exist in at least what may be termed, objectively speaking, mental form. What I am pleased to call, in the absence of a better phrase, mental materialism is a necessary concomitant of every thought. God himself can only be conceived by a certain embodiment, and the incarnation was the necessary connecting link between humanity and divinity.

In the above paragraph it has been assumed that knowledge is possible. Involved in that assumption are an existent world and a thinking mind. Furthermore, we must concede a relation between the two. When these two existences have been brought into relationship, and have begun to interact, whether their offspring has varied or not cannot be positively stated; but certain it is that offspring has seemed to differ according to the point of view, or, to use a broader term, according to the environment, of the observer. One school claims that that theory "has for its foundation the notion of an unknowable force, which is known, however, to be subject to mechanical and necessary laws. . . . All finite minds and persons are but its phenomenal and transitory products. There is but one actor and one thinker."\* "The unknowable declares the doctrine of mechanical evolution to be true." But this doctrine receives material refutation, and that, too, on the ground of its votaries, when we remember that this "mechanical evolution" has been criticised by other men and rejected. Whether the facts or only the environments cause the "unknowable" to give "out a doctrine in the one place as true and in another as the baldest absurdity and falsehood" is an interesting and important question. Certain it is that if the

\* Bowne's *Studies in Theism*, p. 108.



theory of the *unknowable* is correct, then the teaching varies, or else the learners construe the same teaching with remarkable variety. If the difference is in the teacher, then he forfeits all confidence in our search for truth. No science is possible on such a basis, and no knowledge is reliable.

Substantially the same criticism may be made in the case of the "mental evolutionists," who claim that apart from experience we know nothing—that "all beliefs, whether fundamental or derived, represent only the deposit of experience in us." \* So also of the "associationalist," who claims that we "think and believe as we do because we have become used to it." †

In all these schools and shades of schools, thought, the offspring of mind and the world of existence, is regarded as true, no matter how tinged or refracted by prejudice or environment, nor how incapable the mental machine to comprehend the vast relationships or natures presented.

A somewhat similar criticism applies to materialistic schools and modes of reasoning. In these, "thought is a product of the brain, as bile is of the liver." Hence, to speak of thought as true or false would be as absurd in these schools as to speak of bile as true or false. Operate the mental machine, and necessitated thought is produced. Responsibility has no place in these schools of fate. The machine grinds on, and the moral sense cannot distinguish between the true and the false. In fact, there is no moral sense. It must be apparent, also, that there can be no rational sense. Rationalism, in its popular and even in its scientific sense, is a misnomer. Fatalism is the term for the system that ignores God and harnesses every activity to inexorable, necessary, and necessitating law.

Permit us now to push forward to the following statements:

1. Mind exists with a rudder of rational principles;
2. This rudder is determinative for objective fact—that is, it determines the course of thought, or no rational science is possible;
3. Hence this rudder, or rational creator, as a basal fact, must be granted, or no rational science is possible.

A brief comment upon these statements, and this paper ends.

1. That mind exists no one disputes. The old Cartesian doctrine still stands: "I think, therefore I am." That argument granted, and the existence of mind is not only granted,

\* Bowne's *Studies in Theism*, p. 111.

† *Ibid.*, p. 113.

but the existence of that mind in operation is granted. What is implied in the adjunct to proposition 1, above, "with a rudder of rational principles," is also axiomatic, and must be conceded. The mind must be in operation in order to take cognizance of that operation. Again, that operation must be rational or no *ergo* can be predicated. Hence the concession of thought implies the concession of rational thought. Now this term "rational" covers the idea suggested by our term "rudder" in the proposition, "The mind exists with a rudder of rational principles." This being interpreted with a somewhat broader significance than the nautical illustration implies, must mean that mind exists, not simply with a small but directing determining power, which is in point of quantity far inferior to itself, and in point of fact a part of itself, but that power must be, while underlying, at the same time extraneous and incomprehensible in its entirety to the mind. If any one questions this statement I refer him to the unanswered query of the ancient, "Canst thou by searching find out God?" or to his own consciously baffled efforts to comprehend the mysteries, both material and spiritual, that daily demand the attention of his consciousness. One could as easily persuade himself of his own non-existence as that there were no universe or power extraneous to himself. Not only so, but this extraneous power is scarcely thinkable as without rationality, and hence it must be conceived as operating according to rational principles.

2. The second proposition declares that "this rudder is determinative for objective fact." Here "rudder" takes the sense of rationality. Nor is this incompatible with the conclusion of the foregoing paragraph, for our conception of God is that of the highest rationality. Indeed, according to our custom of defining things with their supreme characteristic in view, it were better for us to predicate, not that man has a soul, but that he is a soul, meaning thereby the entirety of the divine that is temporarily imprisoned in the human. It is this rationality that "determines the course of thought, or no rational science is possible." Hence science—all science—is built upon rationality. But what do I mean, what does any one understand, by rationality? Is it a reality or a phantom of the mind? Is it a creature or creator? Did it exist before Adam, was it co-created, or among his earliest growths? Is it human

or divine? Is it generated in the womb of humanity, or has it sat as sovereign lord upon the throne of eternity?

Rationality is the foundation-stone of science, and hence without it no science could exist. Men who think, and declare that there is no God—no rational, omnipotent power—are suffering from supreme egotism or supreme delusion. Du Bois Raymond, in the University of Berlin, himself a champion of Voltaireism, inquired plaintively some years ago, at the close of a lecture on the indestructibility of matter, in which he had boldly avowed that man was merely matter taking his place and making his re-appearance in different material forms—inquired, "*Welche Trost für uns?*"—"What consolation for us?" What thinks any one was his reply? "*Arbeit!*"—"Work!" That might satisfy for a few years an industrious German professor; but for many of us it would be no heaven. I prefer an incomprehensible God, who gives me a spark of himself by means of which I can climb up the gorges and through the deep cañons of truth to the heights where Truth dwells, and where I shall be like Him, rather than to light my torch at his own flame of reason, and then, turning my back upon him, and walking by the light of that torch, declare that there is no God, and trudge down to darkness and despair, or go out into mere materialistic atoms.

3. It seems now that the conclusion of the argument above—a rational creator as a basal fact for science—is inevitable. Existence, not to speak of science, without creation is unthinkable. A creator must, therefore, be the condition of existence; and a rational creator must precede and make possible rational existence. But rational existence is prerequisite to the conception, formulation, and comprehension of science.

If any one claims that too much has been proven when it is shown that a creator must precede creation—that that is simply proving that a creator must have created a creator, and so on *ad infinitum*—I grant it, and confess that God, the Incomprehensible, the Unknowable, must be assumed "in the beginning," whether we start with reason or revelation.

*J. M. Williams.*

ART. IX.—CHRISTIAN AMERICA CHRISTIANIZING  
CHRISTIAN NATIONS.

THE Missionary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church at its recent annual session in Cleveland, O., appropriated certain sums for missionary work in certain countries, as follows: Mexico, \$59,000; Germany, \$35,600; Scandinavia, \$48,350; South America, \$60,545; Switzerland, \$9,500; Italy, \$43,634; Lower California, \$1,000; Domestic Missions in the United States, \$500,000.

It is proper to state that the making of appropriations to such countries and for this purpose is not only one of the prerogatives of the Committee, but one of its imperative duties, which it can neither neglect nor evade. We also observe that the amounts finally adopted are considered indispensable to the safety and progress of the work already established, and that only a small fraction is usually allowed for new work. In looking over the list we discover that it only embraces Christian countries, either substantially or nominally, and that the United States, in addition to exporting the Gospel to the pagan world, is also undertaking to reform existing effete, abnormal, or corrupt religions, and to revive the apostolic institutions in countries already considered to be under the influence of Christianity. In other words, Christian America, besides making effort to rescue the heathen world, is attempting to Christianize Christian nations, which one might suppose should Christianize themselves. Is this our imperative duty?

The question cannot be answered at once by an affirmative or a negative. It means more than appears on the surface, for it involves the significance of the missionary movement of the Church. Without studying its scope one might conclude that the mission of the Church is to the heathen world, and that Christian countries should not mutually aid one another in evangelization. It does not strike the average Christian that it is the duty of Christian America to gospelize Christian Europe; or that the United States should be interested in the regeneration of Germany, Italy, and Scandinavia; or that the Church should establish missions in Mexico and the republics of Spanish America; or that Methodism has a providential mission to

the so-called Christian countries of the globe. As Christian citizens we would resent the attempt of other Christian nations to evangelize us, and we would be shocked to learn that they are raising hundreds of thousands of dollars for missionary work in this land. We condemn with severity the importation of Roman Catholic priests and teachers to this country for Roman Catholic purposes, and yet we organize a missionary movement in Italy for Methodist purposes, partly doing there what the papal power is striving to do here. We state the situation that we may the more clearly discuss it.

The solution of the problem largely, if not wholly, depends on the mission of Christianity as it is revealed in the New Testament. It does not so much depend on our conception of that mission, though we are often governed by our conceptions, as on the mission itself. When the Master organized his kingdom it was with the view of completely transforming all other kingdoms into its likeness, and to charge the earth with its moral teachings and forces. To his mind the order of this moral conquest was incidental; at the least it is not revealed. It does not appear that he contemplated a regular progress from race to race, country to country, nation to nation; but his plan admits of, if it does not authorize, simultaneous movements among all races and nations. Originally providing only for the Jewish people who rejected him, he turned the thought of the Church to the Gentile world without discrimination as to races or countries, and commanded the conquest of the whole. The original commission is still in force, unchanged and unchangeable, allowing no division of peoples into heathen and Christian, pagan and non-idolatrous, or civilized and non-civilized. Such divisions are of human origin, and though based on existing facts they should not interfere with the plain duty to evangelize the world. Wherever there is a non-Christian population, whether in Germany or China, in Mexico or India, there the Church has something to do. With this large conception of the Master's purpose before us we cannot restrict missionary operations to heathen people or refuse to listen to the Macedonian cry of Christian nations. The commission makes no such restriction, and the Church should make none. The notion that "domestic missions," or missions in Christian countries, contradict the primary idea of the missionary movement grows

out of a misconception of the nature and purpose of the movement and of a misinterpretation of the Gospel that authorizes it. It is no more the duty of the Church to send missionaries to Korea than it is to send them to Scandinavia. The missionary movement is impelled in its operations by the double consideration that in some countries the people are heathen and that in others they are non-Christian, or that a large element of their population is non-Christian, needing the Gospel quite as much as the inhabitants of Japan or Borneo. This is the key to the movement and the explanation of duty. But so general a statement requires some elaboration in order to be appreciated. We must, therefore, consider why Christian nations, so-called, are largely non-Christian, and what non-Christian conditions exist in such countries, so that we may justify the missionary movement of the Church in them.

In the Christian countries under consideration Christianity, though exercising its beneficent sway over multitudes, and perhaps dominating the legislation and general customs of the people, exists either but nominally or in a corrupt form, and needs purification, if nothing else, in order to accomplish its purpose. In heathen countries false religions are to be overcome, Mohammedanism, Buddhism, and Taoism resisting the Gospel with force and fury. In some Christian countries a corrupt Christianity, though not as dangerous as a false religion, modifies the true ethics of the Gospel, and gives a false impression of the genius, spirit, and end of true religion, often substituting error for truth, and compromising the spiritual ideals of the Master by an admixture of secularized plans and motives. Against the development of a corrupt Christianity, ever on the border of falsehood, as against heathen religions, the Church should array its talented purpose and reform the one as it would transform the other. Great are the evils of the Oriental religions; they paralyze intellectual life, they depress spiritual aspiration, they benumb the operations of the conscience, they delude with spurious hopes, and they are barren of positive revelations of truth. These, however, are not the only obstacles to true religion in the world. It would be an error to regard the corrupt forms of Christianity as on a level with heathen religions, for they possess a more accurate ethical conception and are under the influence, crippled and muffled as it is, of



revealed truth. Italy and Spain, weighted with superstition and inhaling a perverted Christianity, occupy a higher level than Japan and China, breathing the miasma of the inherited religions of the early dynasties. In its impure state Christianity in such countries is a potent force preparing the way for the higher ideals of the Gospel. Nevertheless, a corrupt Christianity is a hinderance as well as a help to the sway of the true religion. It is a hinderance in that it resists the ethics, the social order, the rights of civil government as enunciated in the New Testament; it is a hinderance in that it neglects to foster public education and denies the right of private judgment; it is a hinderance in that it is opposed to social and moral reforms and the spread and dominion of the kingdom of Christ. For a proper indictment against a corrupt Christianity we may substitute the facts as they exist in Roman Catholic countries—the facts of pauperism, ignorance, crime, disloyalty to constitutional government, licentiousness, Sabbath-breaking, and general depression of public life. France, Italy, Austria, Spain, Portugal, Mexico, and South America testify to the enervating influence of a corrupt Christianity. No less fatal to religious and intellectual development is the presence of the Greek Church in Russia, Greece, and in the provinces of Turkey. It is as much the duty of Protestantism to undertake to reclaim Christianity in all these countries from superstition, error, and corruption as it is to substitute the truths of the Gospel for the teachings of paganism in the Oriental world. Hence we plant the missionary movement in Christian countries to arrest the corruptions and decay of the life-saving religion of the Redeemer.

In this connection it is to be observed that in many of these countries the influence of State churchism is, on the whole, adverse to the rapid development of the religious spirit, and it may be regarded as antagonistic to the mobilizing power of the Gospel. Living in a country where the Church is free, we may underestimate the burdens and afflictions that grow out of the legal unity of Church and State. Germany, however, is a good illustration of the evils of such unity; and so rapid has been the progress of thought in the opposite direction that many of its theologians predict a complete separation in twenty years. It is believed that the change of opinion is



largely due to the presence of Methodism, which, by contrast with the old idea of unity, has taught the people the advantages of separation. In this respect alone the missionary movement has achieved a result that is worth ten times its cost; and we may conclude that one of the many duties of Methodism to the Christian nations of Europe is to teach the freedom of the Church, with all the cognate rights that belong to the doctrine.

Nor, operating as a force in loosening the ties of Church and State, is it at all improbable that it will gradually undermine the undemocratic institutions and governments of the earth. If we measure Protestantism by its statistics we obtain a narrow view of the range of its conquest; but if, studying its principles, we apply them to the world we shall see that it is the great providential agency for the overthrow of false religions, of superstitious faiths, and of despotic and monarchical governments. It is for Methodism to say whether it will narrow its work to the making of Methodistic statistics or broaden its scope so as to include the primary and functional work of Protestantism, and assist in the demolition of religious error and the subversion of civil governments not in harmony with the kingdom of Christ. We are not intimating that it is the direct aim of Protestantism by organized force to overthrow the empires of Europe, but, as the inherent tendency of our riper Protestantism is to republicanism, it should be permitted to do its work on governments as well as religion. Methodism, as a form of Protestantism, can do as much in the indoctrination of the right principles of government as any other Christian agency, and it ought not to hesitate to introduce itself where a false government exists as it introduces itself where a false religion prevails. Its mission is to destroy both, wherever found. Nor is it a fictitious claim that Christianity has modified the forms of civil governments, restrained their warlike designs, curbed the spirit of aggrandizement, purified national legislation, elevated the standard of statesmanship, and given direction to the history of empires. To Christianity, as the prevailing influence, is due the freedom of the serf in Russia and the emancipation of the slave in America; and to its growing power is also due the recent indications of great and impending revolutions in the governments of the world. It should not be forgotten that the

work of Christianity will not be completed until civil kingdoms shall have been transformed into the kingdom of Christ, and that it is to undermine and subvert all unholy governments. Daniel's vision was of contending kingdoms and of the triumph of the stone cut out of the mountain; and the Apocalypse thunders with the battle of kingdoms, ending in the universal peace of a reigning Messiah. To the governments of this world is sent the message of the Almighty to conform to his ideals, and Methodism is doing small work if it exclude from its range and plans the conquest of the worldly empires. This it can accomplish by sowing the gospel seed in the heart of the nations.

The argument that prompts Methodism to undertake the evangelization of the United States according to missionary methods is also the argument for our missionary movement in other Christian countries. The social and moral conditions of our unchurched masses differ little from the social and moral conditions of Europe. The same vices prevail on both continents, as intemperance, lust, greed, infidelity, atheism, materialism, socialism, and general debauchery of the spiritual life. Christian Europe needs the Gospel as well as Christian America; and, substituting philanthropy for patriotism, the Church will eagerly seek to do for the one hemisphere what it gladly does for the other.

Admitting, however, that the American conditions are peculiar, if not abnormal, and that we owe something to ourselves as a nation, we should develop the missionary work among us alongside of the regular work of the Church, so that Christianity may triumph here also. Considered as a missionary field, there is none equal to the United States, either in extent, indigenous resources, responsive inclination to religion, or the permanency of results possible of achievement. In common with other Christian countries we confront Roman Catholicism and the ordinary vices of society; but in addition we confront the peoples of the earth who, leaving the older countries, seek homes among us, some of them assimilating into citizenship, while others retain their foreignisms and are dangerous to the political body. To transform these unregenerate masses into Americans is a duty which both the government and the Church cannot discharge too soon.

The policy of the Church, therefore, in promoting the missionary movement in Christian lands rests for its justification, first, upon the ideals of the Gospel; second, upon the unrestricted commands of the Gospel; third, upon the unselfish law of self-interest, and, fourth, upon progressive results in those lands. In brief, the ideal of the Gospel is a redeemed world in Jesus Christ through the agency of the Church; the command of the Gospel is to go into all the world and preach to every creature; the law of self-interest induces America to evangelize itself, but its highest prosperity can only be achieved when the world is evangelized; and the world's evangelization is as great a probability as was the evangelization of any country before it occurred. A converted heathen world is dependent on a converted civilized or Christian world. The progress of the one is conditioned on the progress of the other. The reflex effect of an aggressive Christianity in Christian lands is felt in heathendom, and the reflex effect of an active Christianity in heathendom is felt in Christendom. That the effect may be large and universal the march of Christianity should be general and uniform. If we would accelerate the great movement of Christianity among the nations we should present the Gospel to all nations, insisting that the time is at hand for national reforms and a higher civilization, and that heathendom is to be conquered, not by army and navy, but by the Church in the name of the Master. And until Protestant and Roman Catholic countries are subdued by the Gospel, becoming themselves the sources of missionary movements, the work of redeeming heathen countries must necessarily be slow and uncertain; for the divine order of progress toward the millennium is from the nations that have received the Gospel to those that have it not, and not from those who never heard it to those that have possessed it through many generations.

*J. W. Mendenhall.*

## EDITORIAL NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

♦♦♦  
OPINION.  
—

VARIOUS ARE THE ATTEMPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITERS to represent the nature, offices, and mission of Jesus Christ, all concurring in the general conception of his being an incarnation of God, the long-predicted Messiah of the Old Testament, and by a vicarious life becoming for every man his Saviour from sin. From these various representations have sprung various theories, doctrines, and heresies, some of which have divided the Church, and all of which have more or less contradicted the original apostolic conception. Students of church history are familiar with the conflicts precipitated by the Monophysite, Arian, Sabellian, and Unitarian heresies; all the result of a misapprehension of a fundamental teaching in Christology—all departures from the simplicities of the Gospel. In these times there is a tendency not only to unity of conception regarding his character, but to place him at the center, and to consider him the substance of all theology, or the standard of interpretation of all truth. Strictly speaking, theology has had a personal basis which in itself is not objectionable; but its mistake has been in its selection of the person upon whose dicta the theological system has been made to rest. It is not to the credit of the Church that in its different branches it has maintained an Augustinian, a Calvinian, a Lutheran, an Arminian, and a Wesleyan theology, because in all these cases they were man-made theologies, with the human bias more prominent than the truth at issue. It seems to have been the purpose of the great historic theologies to gauge, measure, weigh, and determine every biblical problem, and to settle all hermeneutical difficulties by the instruments of speculation and sectarian necessity. Instead of studying the Scriptures from the fundamental conception of theology—that is, from the view-point of Luther, Augustine, or Wesley—theology should be studied from the view-point of biblical revelation, or from the teachings of the divine Master. If it is alleged in behalf of personal theology that its purpose is not to originate doctrine but merely interpret revealed truth, we reply that it has not adhered to its primary function, and in its very nature cannot consent to be interpreter. It originated predestination, “total” depravity, the Anselmic doctrine of atonement, fatalism in human life, and a score of troublesome and world-burdening doctrines; and unchecked, it will continue to manipulate truth in its own interest. If it is alleged against Christocentric theology that it will be narrow and subversive of existing faiths, we reply that we have nothing to do with consequences when truth is at stake. We must choose between no theology at all, or the Christocentric form of truth. The world is choosing; the Church must also choose. It is a gratifying sign of advance that the tendency is toward a Christocentric

interpretation of the biblical system in opposition to the personal bias of distinguished leadership in theology. Henceforth biblical history will be investigated in its relations to Christ's purpose and Christ's kingdom; prophecy will be more fully comprehended in its Messianic significance; the synoptic gospels will be studied as biographies of Christ; the fourth gospel will be regarded as a revelation of the divine element in Christ; Paul's epistles will have their true meaning in the Messiahship and Saviourship of Christ; and Peter's epistles will foreshadow the end of the world under the majestic rule of the returned Son of God. The New Testament is Christocentric; why should not theology go out from the same center and be measured by the same law? Neither incarnation, nor atonement, nor resurrection, nor judgment can have any explanation away from Him who is related to all doctrine, to all events, to all history, to all revelation, to eternal issues. As the New Testament without Christ would be valueless, so a theology not based on him must be fruitful of discord and be wanting in essential vigor and inspiration.

THE FREEDOM OF THE HUMAN WILL is a staple subject in metaphysics and theology. Many scholars have wrestled with it without, it must be confessed, solving the difficulties that it suggests. The chief difficulty seems to arise from its relation to the doctrine of divine sovereignty—that is, the conclusion is proclaimed that the two are irreconcilable. If this is the outcome of the inquiries of rational thinkers we must temporarily accept it, though we confess dissatisfaction with it. We doubt, however, if such a conclusion will always remain as the ultimate thought of man, and we hereby call upon those who are expert in unraveling entangled skeins to try once more and relieve the subject of its knotty inconclusiveness. Weary with platitudes, we demand a new statement of the nature and function of the will and of the rights and limits of the divine sovereignty. It is a reproach to scholarship that this problem remains *in statu quo*, unsolved and apparently insoluble. This is due in part to the view-point from which it is discussed, the thinker being under the influence of the Calvinistic or Arminian basis, and therefore bound to emphasize sovereignty at the expense of freedom or freedom at the expense of sovereignty. The laurel wreath awaits the thinker who, discarding the schools and the postulates of metaphysics, will investigate the subject as though it were a *terra incognita*, and report results whether favorable or disastrous to school-made hypotheses, to Calvinism or Arminianism, or the dicta of text-books and teachers. Why should the thinker be tethered at all? Why should the philosopher or theologian be obliged to secure a permit from a university to go forward in his investigations? It is not what Edwards or Whedon said concerning the will, or whether one demolished the other, that the world wants to know, but to what extent is the will related to character. It occurs to us that unwarrantable claims have been made on both sides of the controversy without shedding a ray of light on the inherent difficulty, and the progress made consists only in making claims, not in solving problems. John Locke said the question is not, "Is the will free?" but,

"Are we free?" To discuss the question as if the will were the only faculty of the mind, or the faculty that is exclusively related to character and responsibility, is exceedingly narrow and unsatisfactory, and must result in conclusions as one-sided as the premises are partial and incomplete. In every human act, moral or otherwise, whether related to character and destiny or not, the entire personality of man is involved, and the freedom of man more than any other single thing involves personality. It cannot be limited to the will without impairing or narrowing personality. Hence, no solution of human freedom is possible that is based on the will alone; it must broaden until it takes in the whole personality. Primarily, therefore, the question does not relate to the freedom of the will any more than it relates to the freedom of the conscience or the freedom of any other faculty. It is not a freedom of faculties, but a freedom of personality that constitutes the question, and the age will crown the man who will break through the net-work of definitions, postulates, and mysteries woven by the metaphysician, and declare that man is not one half as free as he thinks he is, and God does not exercise irrational or mechanical sovereignty over his doomed but redeemed race.

BRITISH WESLEYANISM, like American Methodism, exhibits in striking contrast some phases of conservatism and radicalism. On the whole it is more radical than conservative, needing check rather than spur, because the progressive spirit needs always to be tempered with a due consideration of the lessons of history. In its tendency to accept evolution, indirectly allying itself with the adverse forces of agnostic science, it needs to guard itself lest it go too far. In its sentiment in favor of the ecclesiastical rights of women, opening the doors of the local ministry to her advance, it furnishes a genuine surprise to the American Church, and admonishes conservatism to be less restrictive. According to Wesleyanism, a Christian woman confessing to be called of God to preach may be inducted into the lay ministry, and without ordination or a pastorate may exercise the ministerial function just as any unordained local preacher may exercise the office. This places her on a par with our evangelists, with this difference, that as lay preacher she has official recognition, while as evangelist she is without legal status. The Wesleyan solution of the woman question, so far as it involves ministerial rights, must commend itself to the judgment of all those who are disposed to honor the ministerial instinct in a Christian woman, but who are quite unwilling to invest her with ordained and pastorate rights. By such a plan she can preach, but can sustain no relation to an Annual Conference, with its rights and privileges. Such a plan does not interfere with her liberty to preach, but it does refuse to invest her with pastoral authority—quite another thing. If the ensuing General Conference shall legalize the plan by which women moved by the Spirit to preach may be licensed as local preachers, and enrolled as such in the Quarterly Conference, it will go far toward settling the vexed question of the alleged ministerial rights of women. As this problem is in no sense dependent on that of woman's eligibility to the General Conference the one can



be determined without any reference to the other. English Wesleyanism may teach some ideas that we should hesitate to indorse; but on one of the great questions of modern times it may safely be followed, because its experience confirms its preliminary judgment of the wisdom of its procedure.

PROFESSOR PFLEIDERER, OF BERLIN, is felicitous in the statement that the Epistle of James contains the *practical or working theology* of the Christian Church. He denounces Paul as a dogmatician, and regards John as an idealist; but to his mind James appears as a man of strong common sense, who teaches the ethical phases of the religious life in advantageous contrast with the mystical elements of the system as taught by other apostles. Without eulogizing James more than the other early teachers of Christianity, it is proper to recognize his great services as an expounder of Christian ethics, and to combine his teachings with the higher spiritual dogmatics of the other writers of the New Testament. Considering the worldly character of the Church which he addresses, the social discriminations made by its membership between rich and poor, the inactive habits if not the immoral tendencies of its leaders, and the general supineness and spiritual decay of the vital forces of the Christian community, he was warranted in urging a reform in morals and a return to the first principles of humanity, benevolence, fellowship, and good works in behalf of the suffering and needy. His aim was to revive the Church; not exactly to bring it to a better spiritual condition, but to a more practical ethical life. In order to this he reverts to the Lord's discourses for instruction, quoting from them at least fourteen times, and shows great familiarity with the Sermon on the Mount. In his strongest exhortations to observe the Christian virtues he is an echo of the Master, reiterating the divine injunctions with the fervor and authority of a messenger from God. While not rising to Paul's ideal of the Christian life, he rivets the attention upon the lower or more common ethical aspects, which with the Master were inseparable from the loftier teachings he himself imparted to his disciples. Not for a moment forgetting the true end of Christianity—which is spirituality of character—certain it is that we need a working theology, and it may be found in the ethical system of James. To many minds it might seem impossible to work the ideal theology of John or the philosophic theology of Paul; but the ethical theology of James is workable. As it includes the visiting of the orphan and widow in their sorrow and necessity; of retrenchment of selfish plans and the multiplication of philanthropic deeds; the extinction of greed and the exhibition of fraternalism; the holding in abeyance of religious profession and a manifestation of religious zeal in sacrifices, endurance in trial and persecution, and faithfulness to people of low estate, and general good-will with human sympathies in practical exercise toward all classes, and a genuine effort for righteousness of character by abstaining from fleshly lusts—it ought not to be more difficult of execution than the sublimer life of faith in the mysteries of God. It is a working religion; it is eminently practical; and if lacking in some of the higher elements, it is so helpful, so beneficent,



and so beautiful as to commend itself to the thought and approval of the world, which is averse to John and Paul. By all means work the theology of James; and it may be that John and Paul will finally triumph, too, where James first gains the foothold and first proclaims the law of love.

THE RELATION OF RELIGION to universal truth includes its relation to particular truth, and our knowledge of the former should always precede our knowledge of the latter. In the inductive sciences the process is from particulars to universals, but in deductive philosophy the method is from the general to the single and minute. One of the results of critical research is to demonstrate the superiority of the deductive to the inductive method, the latter of which, however, in the history of artificial mental methods preceded the former; but in the later or higher stage of inquiry the deductive is taking the place of the inductive. As the two methods are compared it will be discovered that whatever of value attaches to the one as a scientific process, it is inferior as an instrument of investigation to the other in theology, metaphysics, psychology, and history. The theistic hypothesis has suffered because usually it has been maintained by inductive methods of reasoning; but it becomes almost a self-evident truth in the light of the deductive process. Pantheism, naturalism, deism, and agnosticism fly away from the presence of the logician who approaches them armed with deductive weapons and who threatens to use them against his foes. Religion as universal truth is to be enforced against any particularism that disputes its integrity. Particular truth must harmonize with universal truth, but universal truth is not required to conform to so-called particular truth. Herein is the secret of the universe, that truth is a whole, and all its forms, phases, and manifestations must agree with the colossal unit. Hence, when truths clash it is evident that one is not a truth; or when the universal and particular come in collision it is proof that the particular is not what it is taken to be. In application of this principle we readily see the difficulty, or the source of conflict, between the universals of religion and the particulars of science. The scientist undertakes to decide as to universals by particulars; but in this he errs, for it is not given to lower truth to determine the higher. The theologian undertakes to determine the value of particulars by his knowledge of universals, and in so doing he acts wisely. In the light of Christian theism the theologian interprets the universe; by the universe the scientist interprets the theistic doctrine, but with the disadvantage that instead of having an adequate starting-point he begins with the conclusion of things. The one starts with a universal, the other with a particular. The one commences with the supernatural, the other with the natural. If religion appropriates all truth, or stands for universal truth, its field is evidently larger than science, which stands for particular truth, and is isolated or unconnected with other truth; and its conclusions, reached by deduction, must be considered of greater worth than the conclusions of science reached by induction. Science, therefore, can only be a school-master to teach the value of religion.

## CURRENT DISCUSSIONS.

## THE LIFE TENURE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPACY.

IN these days of unusual restlessness incident to the progressive tendencies that mark the last decade of the nineteenth century, it is not surprising that the fundamental institutions of Methodism should be made the subject of critical discussion, and that propositions for modification and modernization should occupy the attention of the thoughtful. If the time has not arrived for the reconsideration of our theological basis, concerning which there seems to be almost absolute agreement, certain it is that church government—whether it relate to the increased rights of the laity, the advancement of woman to a legislative position, the restriction or enlargement of the presiding eldership, or the reconstruction of the episcopacy—is a supreme question, to be considered with intelligence and a due regard to the efficiency of Methodism. Nor may these propositions be resisted on the general ground of their radicalism; for, while extremists will suggest impracticable theories and revolutionary schemes, we may trust the sober judgment of the Church to prevent dangerous innovations and at the same time encourage needed reforms and adaptations.

As regards the episcopacy, except the attacks made upon it as the administrative department of the Church by outside organizations, it has largely escaped the criticism of the people for whom it exists. In most respects the Methodist Episcopal Church has been satisfied with the episcopal office, the duties and prerogatives belonging to it, the forty-six incumbents that have honored it, and the constitutional methods of their election to it. If a contrary opinion has at any time prevailed it has had its origin in local or personal reasons which the general Church has not shared, and has been regarded as an exception to the universal sentiment. On such an exception, rather than on any plea of supposed illegitimacy of the episcopacy or of the weakness, corruption, or uselessness of the office, some discussion as to modification is now pending. Various suggestions respecting reform are made: one, looking to diocesan superintendency; another, proposing rotation in office; and still another, arguing for the abolishment of the office, conforming American Methodism to British Wesleyanism: all indicating an uncertain and feverish state of mind eager for change without determining just what is wanted, or whether any change whatever is desirable.

Of all the schemes proposed for episcopal reform we regard that which strikes at the life tenure as most unwise and full of danger. Under the momentum of a mere sentiment it were easy to convert into a popular movement the notion that rotation in office, or re-election every four years of our general superintendents, is republican in spirit and necessary to the highest efficiency of the episcopacy; but once secured, the evil of the movement would be apparent to all. It is proper, therefore, before it has gained any parliamentary advantage, to consider what

such a movement means, and to interpose an obstacle to its progress. No advocate of the episcopacy as it is will claim that it is a perfect institution, or that our system of government is unimprovable; but allowing that it is not ideally complete in its constructive and adaptative equipments, it is unwise to tear it into pieces and pronounce it an abomination. We willingly allow the imperfection of the whole, but any other system would be deficient, and similar difficulties would confront us in working it. All that may be asked for our episcopal system is that its defects be remedied without striking at its fundamental principle, and that the disadvantages of the system be reduced to the lowest limits.

Episcopacy is an ecclesiastical word, implying the government of the Church by bishops, as Presbyterianism implies government by presbyters, and as Congregationalism implies government by both clergy and laity. If the New Testament instructs on the subject, it permits one kind of government as well as another, but in no instance does it warrant one to the detriment of another. In our liberalistic construction of apostolic teaching, any form of government adopted by the Church is legitimate, and no form can be said to be unscriptural. From the *Didache* we learn that bishops and deacons, worthy of the Lord, were appointed in the infant Church, and that bishops and presbyters were synonymous terms. St. Clement of Rome, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, says the apostles appointed bishops and deacons, but "in no new fashion;" by which we understand that ordained pastors consisted of presbyters and deacons—the two orders of the ministry. To this apostolic precedent Methodism has strictly conformed, not because it was mandatory, but because it had the force of a judicious example which commended itself to the fathers of Methodism. It was at this point that the Church of England departed from the apostolic example, for it established an episcopate not hinted at in the New Testament, and instituted a third order in the ministry. It is, therefore, a concession to truth to substitute "historic episcopate" for "apostolic succession;" and if the Church of England will honestly confess that it borrowed the episcopate it now maintains from the third century, and not from the New Testament precedent or teaching, it may heal the breach which it created in Christendom. With no specific warrant on the subject the question of government has excited friction in Protestantism, dividing it into many religious bodies, and it is the chief corner-stone of the papal hierarchy. St. Clement says that the "apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishop's office." History has verified the prophecy of friction over the office and the title of the incumbent. In the early history of Methodism it had to contend for the right to ecclesiastical existence, defending its episcopal government and the legitimacy of its self-proclaimed and self-originated independence. In this contest we have won the victory, compelling the advocates of "apostolic succession" not only to explain themselves, but to defend their indefensible attitude toward Christendom, and to attempt to give a reason for their continued existence.

Having demonstrated the providential and historic triumph of its episcopacy, with its life tenure and non-diocesan characteristics, Methodism should be slow to re-open the question, or consider the expediency of reducing its tenure, or constituting an episcopacy whose chief feature shall be the rotation or ineligibility of incumbents after a given number of years of occupancy. The proposition to place it within sight of the clock or under the hammer is fraught with more evils than can be enumerated, while the advantages that accrue to the Church under the episcopacy as it is counterbalance all the disadvantages that may be imagined.

What is the episcopacy? It is usual to designate it as the appointing power in Methodism; but, while this is not a comprehensive view of its functions and relations, it will appear from a moment's reflection that a short-term episcopate will reduce the high prerogative of supplying the churches with pastors into a mechanical and undisguised political performance, resulting in the degradation of the episcopacy and peril to the itinerant system. Like Elijah, every bishop is a man of like passions with other men, and it is useless to expect that ambition for re-election will expire in him so soon as his elevation to the bishopric shall have been accomplished. Such an ambition is not necessarily unholy, nor does it signify a lust for power; but human nature does not readily relinquish its opportunity to accept power when it may be lawfully gained. It is granted that, in order to circumvent ambition for re-election, ineligibility to a second term might be made a condition of election to the office; but in that event our superintendents would be men ever learning and never able to come to a knowledge of their high position. A diocesan or a short-term bishop may be a very weak man; but a general superintendent should be strong, wise, pure, a man of intellect and approved of God. In selecting men for the general superintendency with a life-tenure the Church will be more careful than if it were choosing men for a short term or for diocesan purposes. The short-term plan, with privilege to re-election, offers inducements to political scheming such as are impossible in the present plan, or promises an incompetent, hastily chosen, and uncertain class of superintendents. The proposition is a step downward, with no corresponding advantages. Every Annual Conference would feel that it had for president a politico-ecclesiastical bishop, who would be interested in the election of delegates to the General Conference, and who would be under the influence of the delegates-elect during the remainder of the session. Every court of appeal would have for chairman a man whose eyes might be open to future friendships and whose hands might be open to bribes. The Church at large, complaining occasionally of the reign of the political spirit in General Conference elections, would realize that the highest office in its gift is the subject of political manipulation, and its incumbents would be regarded as a trifle more adroit than their unsuccessful rivals. It seems to test the Church to be required to elect all other officers every four years; but to add the duty of electing bishops every four or eight years would be more than a General Conference could endure. The sea of ecclesiastical politics would boil over. This may reflect on human nature, but the problem

must be treated in the light of facts and probabilities. The short-term plan, or rotation in office, simply means perpetual ecclesiastical ferment, with no decided gains either to the bishops or the Church, but an opening of Pandora's box, with all its evils, into the lap of Methodism.

The episcopacy, however, is more than the appointing power in the Church, and any proposed modification must have regard to the larger interpretation which the office bears. It represents the collective elements, forces, and functions of Methodism as no other department of the Church can represent them, and is in this respect indispensable to the integrity and solidity of Methodism. It is inherently the expression of the consummation of the significance of Wesleyan religion. It is, in concrete phrase, the *incarnation of connectionalism* which is the secret of our strength and the inspiration of our activities. To the uninformed, connectionalism may seem to be that mysterious bond or principle that separates Methodism from other organizations, or that exclusive system that shuts out external factors of co-operation; but this conception or definition is not all-inclusive. There is a connectionalism that is selfish, Jesuitical, seeking its own ends, aiming at self-preservation. There is also a connectionalism that represents the unity of power in an organization whose purpose is the extension, not of itself, but of that which it represents. Methodistic connectionalism is of the latter kind—a union of all Methodistic plans, teachings, and activities, or a concentration of Methodistic forces for the good of mankind. In what way may connectionalism be preserved and promoted? Neither by the decrees of the General Conference nor by the conservatism of broad-minded and far-seeing pastors, nor scarcely by our connectional societies, though all these powerfully contribute to its maintenance, but chiefly through an itinerant episcopacy, which guards with jealous loyalty the whole system from innovation, and perpetuates it throughout the Church by the connectionalism of which it is the chief exponent. Methodism is a connectional system, perpetuating itself through a connectional episcopacy. To strike at episcopacy is to strike at the inherent connectionalism of the system, and the whole falls to the ground. It is useless to hope to preserve the connectional power of the episcopacy by reducing the official tenure, for in that case the connectional principle will no longer be an aim of the episcopacy. The spirit of unity will be lost in the rapid changes of the incumbents, who will be more concerned with personal interests than with the perpetuation of a system that hitherto has depended upon the episcopal force for continuity in government and unification of the highest forces in Methodism.

Among the duties of a Methodist bishop are those requiring him "to travel through the Connection at large," and "to oversee the spiritual and temporal business of our Church" (*Discipline of 1888*, ¶ 161, §§ 6, 7). We affirm that a bishop under a time-limit can very imperfectly, if at all, discharge these duties according to the spirit of the law. He would reduce himself to a diocesan bishop *de facto*, while he would be a general superintendent *de jure*. He could not include in his range the demands

of world-wide Methodism, nor could he oversee the business of the Church among all nations. A diocesan bishop understands his diocese, but he is not equally well informed of all parts of his church field. Our superintendents necessarily are men acquainted with Methodism in all lands, and have a world-wide knowledge of Christianity in all its movements, and of changes in governments and religions, with their effects on the Church and Methodism. No other class of men among us are engaged in the world-wide survey of Christianity, and we cannot afford to sacrifice the advantages that accrue to the Church from these officers and their opportunities to conciliate the surge for change. Hence we view with alarm the indirect assault recently made upon connectionalism as a principle of church-life, for it betokens a more direct assault upon episcopacy. The two stand or fall together.

It is no small argument for the life tenure of the episcopacy that it represents to the world the fact of a great itinerant Church, with no other object than the moral improvement and redemption of the race. Other Churches with diocesan bishops or a settled pastorate impress the world that they are rooted in society, with noble humanitarian prospects in view; but the itinerant Church, with bishops flying over the world, like the angel in the Apocalypse, and with pastors going to and fro, must impress men that it labors under the conviction that its business requires haste and that it has no time to rest or settle. The itinerant Church is set over against the settled Church, and is efficient only while it is in motion. The itinerancy is another of the distinguishing marks of Methodism, with which it cannot afford to part; and the episcopacy, with its itinerating duties, can do more to preserve it from decay than all other agencies combined. The short-term plan diminishes the probability of a perpetual itinerancy; for short-term bishops would fall in with spasmodic movements for violent or revolutionary changes, and even instigate them if it were necessary to promote individual ends. *To an episcopacy that is permanent in character, a unit in conviction respecting our ecclesiasticism, and harmonious in respect to fundamental doctrine, the Church may safely commit connectionalism, itinerancy, doctrinal integrity, and all other institutions that require constant guardianship for their preservation.*

The value of the episcopacy to Methodism is somewhat contingent on the element of stability and permanency which the life tenure confers upon it. The short term, or rotatory plan, has had full experiment in our history in all the other official positions of the Church. The time-limit is imposed upon the pastorate; the quadrennial election of editors, book agents, and connectional secretaries is a constitutional requirement; and whatever of evil or good may inhere in the experiment or law requiring it has been realized in these departments. It is quite enough to observe that there is a growing desire in Methodism practically to abolish, under suitable restrictions and safeguards, the time-limit respecting all positions, pastoral and otherwise, on the ground that men add to the probability of increased efficiency by prolonged and uninterrupted experience in such positions. It is inopportune, therefore, and anomalous, that while the general tend-



ency is to longer terms of service in other positions the proposition to shorten the term of the episcopacy should be sincerely mooted. To lengthen the short terms and shorten the long terms is a legislative contradiction that will hardly bear inspection.

Moreover, the episcopacy is a unique department, differing from all others in essential faculties and prerogatives, though resting upon the common basis of the eldership. The bishop is *primus inter pares*, but separated from the elders by official lines he is *primus* alone; that is, he is first because of a difference of prerogative and of a difference of tenure. To limit the difference to prerogative is to limit the prerogative which for its fullest exercise and development requires the unlimited arena and life-spaces of Methodism. It is clear that no time-limit is affixed to the presbyter; that is, he is a presbyter for life and he is a pastor for life, except as crime may deprive him of either of these functions. In like manner the bishop, being a presbyter, is *per se* under no time-limitation, though it is within the province of the Church to delimit or even abolish his office. Without the interposition of the Church the presbyter elected to the episcopacy carries the life tenure from his order into his office. If life tenure apply to the higher, or the order in the ministry, surely it may apply without injury to the lower, or an office in the ministry. If it be said that this implies, therefore, that editors and secretaries, going from an order to an office, carry the life tenure of the one into the other, thereby permitting them to remain for life in their positions, we reply that the difference of function between a bishop and other officers makes the life tenure of the one a necessity and the short tenure of the other an expediency. The episcopacy would dash itself into pieces on the rotatory plan; other departments, sometimes crippled by it, are possessed of a potency that enables them to survive the disasters of frequent mutation. In its very nature the episcopacy is dependent on permanency for its efficiency; other departments are efficient in spite of the adverse influence of change, or possibly because of it. Whatever the origin of Christian episcopacy, for there have been political episcopacies, nothing was said at the time, or later, in reference to the official tenure of the *ἐπίσκοπος*, except to confirm the view that it should be for life. In none of the ancient churches, Greek or Latin, and in none of the modern, the Church of England or the Methodist, was a bishop ever appointed or elected for any period less than life. Rejecting or accepting the episcopacy as a third order, no difference of sentiment has ever prevailed as to tenure. There have been differences as to prerogatives and differences as to "order," but none as to tenure. From the time of Cyprian to the present day the bishop in all the Churches, except some minor bodies that do not affect history, has been a life officer, not simply because he exercised spiritual prerogatives, but also because he represented the integrity of the Church. We accuse Episcopalians, so called, of perverting the New Testament in favor of their peculiar government; let it not be said of us that we have departed from the true history of life-tenure episcopacy by imposing a time-limit on the highest office in the Church. In maintaining our episcopacy as it is we are not



imitating the Roman Catholic and other Churches, but we are conforming to history in the essential birth-mark of a genuine episcopacy.

It surely has occurred to students of Methodism that, with the law of mutation applied to all its pastors and officers, it is well that one department, and that the highest, is exempt from it. In the episcopacy alone inheres the element of stability, the value of which cannot be expressed in a line. It secures coherence and continuousness of administration in all sections of Methodism; it produces men of commanding power and of national, if not international, influence; it commands the respect of other denominations which boast of the permanency of the pastoral institution; it promotes connectionalism without enforcing it with the penalty of law; it conserves the itinerancy by applying it to every pastor, and every bishop submitting to it himself; it secures doctrinal unity by preaching the standards of religion and discouraging heretical tendencies in men who rely more upon their own disaffected judgments than upon the teachings of the Church; it insures general loyalty of Methodism to itself and solidity of the entire structure of the Church as the greatest evangelizing force in Christendom. If it is a proof of wisdom in the United States government to appoint the judges of the Supreme Court for life or good behavior, is it not equally the mark of wisdom in the Church to elect to the episcopacy men who, because the life tenure belongs to it, shall be free from political influence and intrigue, and all those common prejudices which enter so largely into other relations and positions?

We submit that, as against the evident advantages of a life-tenure episcopacy, no objection has appeared which can stand for a moment. If an episcopacy be deemed a necessity at all the life tenure is the essential of its life. To this conclusion have we come, believing that honest brethren entertain an opposite opinion; but the objections raised and arguments used in opposition to this view are superficial in content, limited in their range of view, and *altogether theoretic and untenable*. It is sometimes alleged that a short term episcopacy, with privilege of re-election, will curtail the manifest tendencies to despotism or papal dictatorship in the incumbents. It is granted that our episcopacy is clothed with extraordinary powers, which in the hands of unscrupulous men may be abused and the possessor thereof become a tyrant, for in the matter of making appointments the power of the bishop is absolute; but this extreme exercise of power is exceptional, and when it has occurred in an offensive form it has been offset by the benefits that have followed its prompt use in other cases. It deserves to be said that, instead of despotic tendency in our episcopacy, it is exhibiting more leniency than ever, and too often is forgetful of its supreme prerogatives. The tendency is away from despotism. We make the point that the absolute power of the episcopacy has, when exercised, been more beneficent than tyrannical, and conserved rather than injured Methodism. It has saved many a minister's reputation, made possible many a pastor's success, and rescued churches from despondency and rebellion. The Church needs not to be afraid of the absolute prerogatives of the episcopacy; it might well tremble if they were less. But it is not

certain that the rotatory plan would be less liable to promote possible despotism, unless with the reduction of the tenure it is proposed also to abridge prerogatives. In such an event the episcopacy would be a useless appendage to Methodism.

To some minds there is a fascination in the thought of equality of tenure in all official positions, and of the reduction of the bishops to the level of other itinerants. The presiding elder may be appointed for six years in succession; the pastor for five years; editors, secretaries, and agents are elected for four years, with right of re-election; and the bishop is elected for life. A scheme of equality would require that all officers, from the highest to the lowest, and all pastors, in whatever relation to the Church, shall occupy their positions but four, or six, or eight, or a greater number of years, with or without the right of re-election or re-appointment; but who proposes such a scheme? If proposed could it be worked to the advantage of Methodism? We think not.

It is also said that a life-tenure bishop is not as other pastors amenable to an Annual Conference for his conduct, and soon learns to despise responsibility. The Discipline provides for his arrest and trial in case of wrong-doing, nominating penalties in case of conviction; the General Conference reviews his administration, approving or condemning, and is not disposed to be more lenient in investigation or in reaching a conclusion than an Annual Conference in dealing with one of its members; hence, the surveillance is complete. According to our law, the episcopacy has its day of judgment every four years, and *ad interim* is under the restrictions and penalties that appertain to the itinerant system, and which exercise a wholesome influence on individual conduct and official administration.

It is declared that other Churches maintain a time-limit episcopacy, with right of re-election, and why cannot the Methodist Episcopal Church? Sadly we refer, in reply, to the Evangelical Association, now torn into factions over just such an episcopacy, and insist that a study of that example should be sufficient to deter Methodism from changing its form of episcopacy.

In conclusion, we take pleasure in pointing to our itinerant episcopacy as worthy of the continued confidence of the Church, especially when viewed in contrast with the diocesan episcopacy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and in contrast with the presidential system of British Wesleyanism. Whatever its limitations it never has usurped its functions; it never has dishonored the Church; it never has stood for wrong; it never has been impeached for ecclesiastical disloyalty; it never was unfaithful to the country's flag; it never reduced itself to a political machine; it never received the contempt of Christendom. The experiment of a life-tenure presbyterial episcopacy, furnished by Methodism, is worth something, and it should not be changed to gratify caprice or radical sentiment which, under thorough analysis, appears to be more reactionary than progressive, and promises less for the Church than any reform proposed in these days of new things.

## METHODISM: CENTRIPETAL OR CENTRIFUGAL?\*

HISTORICALLY interpreted, Methodism is a religious movement endowed with the swing of conquest. Whatever its limitations in other respects it is possessed with a purpose to take the world, and adapts its agencies to this end. A Church with no ecumenical tendency, without ecumenical methods and resources, is deficient in the essential spirit of success. Animated with any other purpose than that of the subjugation of the world, controlled by any other view than that of universal dominion, satisfied with any thing less than the triumph of its principles, it may, under other motives, attain to great respectability, vast social influence, and political prestige, but it has failed as a true Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. We insist that world-wide conquest should be its aim, and that openly. Its high resolve should not be the secret of the few, nor an esoteric teaching unknown to mankind, but it should be proclaimed every-where and with reverberating emphasis that the Church has no other object in the world, and no other relation to the earthly life of man, than to place in dominion over all things and all flesh the Ancient of Days, revealed in these times as the Son of God.

In asserting its mission the Church should declare that the dominion which it seeks to promote is not for itself, nor the maintenance of the visible dominion of an ecclesiasticism. The Church does not exist for itself, but is the instrument for the propagation of the kingdom of God; and it is therefore subordinate to a higher purpose than its own glory or its specific triumph. What avail the successes of Methodism if they do not intrench the divine kingdom in the world?

This is so often forgotten in the zeal to build up denominational forms as to demand at this time most serious consideration. How far the Church

---

\* It falls not within our province to record the proceedings of the Ecumenical Conference, or to indulge in a biography of its members, or to analyze its far-reaching discussions; but, as it was suggestive of so many reflections and contained in itself the germs of movements which if consummated will add to the public influence of Christianity, it is our duty to consider them in their present aspects and future possibilities. The delegates of the Eastern Section were picked men, trained to think, and acquitted themselves with honor; the delegates of the Western Section represented the intelligence and Christian resources of the New World, and grew stronger by contact with Old World ideas, while the Old World itself, in our elastic atmosphere, expanded far beyond its chronic limitations. The opening sermon, by the Rev. William Arthur, on "Immanuel and His Mission," disclosed in matchless beauty the spiritual ideal of the Redeemer, and foreshadowed the triumph of his Church. The memorial sermon, on "John Wesley and his Mission," by Bishop John P. Newman, was the literary masterpiece of the Conference, being an imperial representation of the work of the greatest ecclesiastic known to history since the days of St. Paul. The various papers and addresses delivered before the Conference were of practical value, while the brief discussions exhibited versatility, difference of view, but on the whole the Methodistic instincts of the whole body.

may promote its individuality is a question not to be ignored; but that its chief function is self-aggrandizement in the earth, or self-dominion, must be rejected. Shall the Church be centripetal or centrifugal? A centripetal Church, employing all its resources and agencies in strengthening its organization and intensifying its influence in the world, may be inefficient as the representative of the divine projects. It may do much for itself but little for the Master. If it be given to ritualism, sacerdotalism, architecture, and religious machinery in general, preferring these to the spiritual ideals of Christianity and the ethics of the Gospel, there may be pomp and show, but there may not be the fruit of the Spirit or the exaltation of the Son of God. On the other hand, a centrifugal Church, seeking secular power as its chief end, often grasping political agencies that it may turn them to its own account, will be no less fruitless and no less a failure. In some respects Methodism, while subordinating the centripetal to the centrifugal ultimate, has measurably avoided the extremes noted above. It is a centripetal movement developing personal characteristics, differentiating itself from all other organizations by original peculiarities; but it never loses itself in self-consciousness, it never aims at its own preservation and perfection as its chief work. It stops not with itself, but follows its centrifugal instincts into all the world, determined to reorganize humanity on the divine basis, and to remove sin into the background of history. Methodism is not seeking to build a great Church in the earth, but to push forward the kingdom of God. *It is a providential movement rather than a churchly ecclesiasticism.* It adjusts its methods to this idea, it seizes every opportunity to promote this end, it sacrifices temporal advantage and should be willing to sacrifice itself for the sake of the consummation. Methodism is nothing except as a providential instrument for providential purposes. If it perfect itself in its organizing aspects—if it abandon traditional ideas and procedures—if it centripetalize its thought to any extent and for any period, it is only to add to its centrifugal power and conquer the world for its Master. Hence, Methodism can never content itself with self-introspection, or the symmetry, order, beauty, and perfection of its church life, or have for its predominant purpose the establishment and prosperity of a great church.

The Ecumenical Conference of the various Methodisms of the globe, recently held in Washington, D. C., emphasized rather by its spirit than by its form or open declaration the thought that the mission of Methodism is centrifugal, and *that its centripetal forces are for centrifugal purposes.* Methodism is not to save itself so much as to save the world. In executing this broad, philanthropic, and self-sacrificing purpose it relies upon certain ecumenical tendencies, elements, or forces which are constitutional and inherent in its life. In the presence of these larger forces we waive the consideration of those subordinate agencies which, common to all religious movements, powerfully contribute to their stability and far-reaching influence. It is enough that we consider the fundamental forces of Methodism as manifested in the second great council of the Churches of the one faith.

We may startle ourselves, if not other denominations, by reiterating the fact of the *doctrinal solidarity of Methodism*. Touching the great truths of Christianity—whether the sublime doctrines of theism, soteriology, and eschatology, or the simpler ethical codes of the Judaic and Christian economies—there was not a discordant note in the great Conference. Though twenty-nine different Methodisms were catalogued in its list, the agreement on doctrine, perhaps even to definition, was complete, and the fact is a monumental rebuke to other Churches that have derided our doctrine. Methodism illustrates the compatibility of the divisive spirit in the Church on ecclesiastical grounds with stability and unity of doctrine—a lesson that should not be lost. It may be our disgrace that there is division on small technicalities, but it is to our credit that we maintain a single faith. We have rent ourselves, but not our doctrines. The value of this statement is increased by remembering that the divisions in Calvinistic Churches are divisions not on politics but on doctrines—the reverse of the condition in Arminian bodies. The one divides on polity but not on doctrine; the other divides on doctrine but not on polity. In this palpable fact is the prophecy of the stability of the Arminian system, as a whole, and the decay of the Calvinistic system, as a whole. When Calvinists attack Calvinism Arminians may hold their peace and refrain from war. Considering the differences in men, arising from temperament, education, and opportunity, it is phenomenal that with all the divisions in Methodism no one has occurred on heretical grounds. The fact is a study, a problem that cannot be solved at once. We do not attribute it to Mr. Wesley, for he could not retain Mr. Whitefield; nor to any organizing genius, for no one has forced unity of faith; nor to the absence of independent judgment, for division on any ground proves its existence; nor to any human attempt to preserve unity of doctrine. Rather it is due to the inherent truthfulness of the Wesleyan conception of the biblical system in its inspirational character and that supervising providence that causes great movements to harmonize on a divine basis. Whatever their politics, Methodists would as soon organize a revolt against their theology as mathematicians would organize against notation or the axioms of geometry. In this solidarity Methodism is supreme, impregnable. It should not be forgotten, however, that the doctrinal unity of Methodism is chiefly devoted to centrifugal ends. The highest object of the Church is the redemption of the race through the power of the truth. If the Church is the instrument for the propagation of the kingdom of God the truth is the instrument in the activities of the Church—"Thy word is truth." Paul's injunction to "preach the word" is literally obeyed in our world-wide Methodism. Respecting the Bible as the revelation of God's plans and ideals, of God's teachings and methods, and of God's agency in human history with his final purpose in Jesus Christ, there is a singular oneness of faith and teaching in universal Methodism. As to subordinate matters there may be differences, but as to the Messianic redemption we are one. This is the glory of Methodism; this is its power; this is its preaching; this accounts for its prosperity. In the

Ecumenical Conference the same doctrinal faith was uttered by delegates from Australia, Canada, Ireland, France, England, and the United States; the same hymns were sung by all, and the same evangelistic spirit breathed in every prayer; and all this without mental reservation or disquietude or suspicion touching the system of religion known by the distinctive name of Methodism.

We are bound to note the *marked tendency to ecclesiastical unity* which the Conference enthusiastically manifested. We write with shame that almost without excuse many schisms and divisions have occurred in Methodism, and the only reason they have not destroyed the Church is because they originated in trifling considerations, and because the doctrinal tie was stronger than the ecclesiastical. In our missionary fields, where several Methodist bodies are at work, they use different hymn-books, and appear to heathen communities as rivals or antagonists, losing influence and delaying success. In civilized lands we waste time in strife and money in maintaining separate offices for similar departments growing out of separate organizations. More than a score of Methodisms exist when they might coalesce into a vast army and shake the earth with its tread. Is such union possible or desirable? Missionaries of all Methodisms plead for it; the Ecumenical Conference was *en rapport* with it; the seven British Methodisms took immediate action in Washington looking to union; the three great colored Methodisms of the United States also conferred among themselves, and before adjournment reported in favor of organic unity—a great achievement even if not consummated; but the white Methodisms of the United States are likely to be in the rear on the great subject. The Methodist Episcopal Church is ready for union to-day, and extended through Bishop Foster an unofficial but authoritative overture to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for union with that severed branch; but it met with no response. It may be truthfully said that Bishop Keener lost the opportunity of a life-time, and the Church South an occasion pregnant with great possibilities to exhibit more than a spirit of fraternity—to heal the breach of fifty years, and to consolidate the two mightiest forces in the republic for its evangelization.

The North grieves over the strife-producing policy of the South. Politically the North and the South are harmoniously united under one government, and the nation is reconstructed; but the Church continues its unseemly division—a scandal on the pages of American history, a blot on our beloved Methodism. It cannot be that Southern Methodism, as a whole, is conservative, reactionary, and a stumbling-block to the divine idea of unity; at the least we prefer to think that Providence, by funerals or otherwise, will bring it to a better mind. If this be considered unkind, we explain by saying that our desire for unity may be stronger than that charity which is necessary to it. Can any sufficient reason be given for the continued separation of the Methodist Protestant Church, or of the isolation of the United Brethren Church? In any proposition looking to union with these or other Churches the Methodist Episcopal Church should be prepared to concede as much to them as they would be asked to concede to it. Union



is only possible on reciprocity of concession, and this all the religious bodies involved should acknowledge and in their action respect. It will be admitted that, whatever the causes that originally induced division or separation, they are either extinct or are inoperative as alienating forces. In general, the original causes, studied in the light of history, were allowed a potency far exceeding any warrant, and some of them should not have availed for division. If the difference between the preachers of British Wesleyanism and those of the Primitive Methodists is that the former ride and the latter walk in their circuit work, it may be said that the differences between the Methodist bodies in this country are no greater and of no higher import. Slavery was the cause of division, but it no longer exists. The principle of lay delegation was an original cause of division, but it has triumphed in the great branches of Methodism. If it be said that the ownership of church property raises an obstacle to union, we reply that it is of easy adjustment; or that union involves the sacrifice of personal leadership or the transference of supreme power to the Methodist Episcopal Church, we reply, neither is such sacrifice asked or expected, nor is the consolidation of power in a single branch a possibility. If all other Methodisms should unite with our Church it would be a minority, and powerless to exercise dictatorship. If the Negro is made the obstacle to union it is proof of the power of prejudice, which until broken must corrupt and degrade the Church. We submit that the time for union is at hand, and a fearful responsibility will rest upon the Church that prevents it. The divisive spirit in Methodism has reached its limits. The next movement will be toward consolidation—to the expression of the unity that exists and to some form of organic union. If attained, however, it will be not for itself, but for centrifugal ends, to achieve more rapidly the conquest of the world for Christ and to be able to resist the more immediate antagonisms to that end.

It was inevitable that the relation of Methodism to modern scientific and biblical thought should have discussion; nor would any true friend of Christianity have opposed such discussion. The facts of science, the laws of nature, are common property, and have a bearing on the theistic hypothesis, while systems of religion may be affected more or less by the phenomena of matter as understood in the light of discovery and study. The natural, however, may not decide the supernatural, though the supernatural may illuminate the natural. It is supposed the great question is the supernatural; it is the *greater* question, for the natural is still a question. Mr. Bunting's paper, in so far as it inclined to apply evolution to the realms of ethics and religion, was entirely too radical for the American theologian. He even intimated that Jesus Christ was the unique product of evolution, and that the problems of sin and redemption are within the purview of scientific analysis and determination. Supported in these positions by the British delegation, we were painfully impressed that Christian thought in English Methodism was on the road to materialism, and that evolution was mastering the supernatural.

Professor Davidson's paper was made the occasion of strong expressions



by a contingent of the British delegation respecting some of the questions of the "higher criticism;" but while devout and tentative in their suggestions they seemed to be more in harmony with the dangerous march toward evolution than the paper warranted. We know these are recent changes in English Methodism, but the arguments for them are neither new nor strong. We might venture to ask, if the Church proposes to adopt materialistic and rationalistic views of supernatural questions, how may it hope to win in its conflicts with materialism and rationalism? We do not charge the Wesleyan Church with a stampede over to the enemy, but it manifests a tendency in marked contrast with the orthodox solidity of American Methodism. As the latter was taunted with being twenty years behind English Methodism, we propose only to state the situation that it may be apprehended. In these respects the difference between English and American Methodism is not a difference of step, the former being faster and the latter slower; but it is a difference of direction, the one being headed toward materialism and rationalism, the other marching on with its back toward both. Wellhausen, Huxley, Spencer, Smith, Cheyne, Dillmann, and kindred thinkers do not mold Methodist thought in America; and it grieves us to learn that, without any new arguments, without original investigation for themselves, so many Wesleyan brethren are inclined to tinker with exploded hypotheses and forget the historical grounds of their faith. Methodism has not hitherto divided on doctrinal grounds; but a division of that body on heretical grounds may be a remote possibility. The conflict is not between orthodoxy and rationalism, but between rationalism and truth. However, there is no real footing for pessimism in the utterances of the more radical thinkers of the Conference. The liberalism which they declared by no means represents a solid heretical movement in Wesleyanism, though it indicates some uncertainty as to certain teachings in the minds of those who were happy in asserting their new freedom from the bondage of antiquity. It is well known that English scholars are doing more to circumvent and overthrow the evil that lurks in rationalistic criticism than all other scholars in Christendom. In this regard England may be safely trusted, and Wesleyanism needs only to be wise, as it will be, to prevent its disintegration. With a tendency to differences on the great questions of revelation, it will be difficult to maintain the unity which has marked the career of Methodism, and has been her glory and strength. Instead of marching together against materialism and all forms of skepticism we may, unless we be careful, divide into hostile sections warring, not against the foe, but with one another on some vexed question for sectional supremacy. Instead of being a centrifugal Church we shall then have degenerated into a centripetal Church, fighting for self-preservation, and dishonoring the name we bear by unseemly strife over differences that cannot co-exist in a progressive and Christly Church.

The tendency to disintegration, or great internal disturbance from this or any other cause, is very much lessened by the consideration that the

representative Methodisms in the Conference seemed more anxious to combine against the recognized evils of the world than to give expression to differences on mere hypothesis. The Church is organized to combat evil, and so long as it is devoted to its purpose serious division is impossible. Much time was given to the discussion of such questions as Romanism, temperance, socialism, gambling, betting, divorce, and amusements—all weighty with issues in their political, social, and religious aspects; while such subjects as education, the place and power of lay agency in the Church, the religious and secular press, the family and Sunday-school, the deaconess movement, with final stress upon the Christian resources of both hemispheres, received large if not adequate treatment, resulting in enlightenment and plans of progress along every line of Christian activity. In the federation of the Churches, or unity of purpose on the part of all the Methodisms against the hydra-headed evils of the day, is the safety of the Church, both against internal dangers and external antagonisms. Against such evils Methodism is distinctly centrifugal, warring with a wisdom that utilizes all resources, an earnestness that counts temporary defeat a little thing, and a power that, gathering momentum as it goes, is simply magnificent in its sweep and its prophecy of ultimate success.

The Ecumenical Conference takes its place in history among those ecclesiastical movements that survive the times that originated them, and continue to affect public opinion long after their leaders have passed away. In a very eminent sense its work was practical, legitimate, fraternal, wholesome. It dealt with great problems, not in a speculative or philosophical way, but philanthropically, with wide vision upon all their aspects, with a statesmanship free of guile, and in the spirit of the Master of assemblies. It reached conclusions and affirmed them; it matured judgments and expressed them; it favored progress because the kingdom of God is progressive; it defended the family, the children, the Sabbath, the school, the State, the Church; it arraigned the evil-doer in high places and pronounced in favor of the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount; it was free of bigotry in that it indulged in few criticisms of other Churches; it restrained self-pride in that statistics were not paraded as our chief glory; it recognized difficulties in pagan and Christian countries, but asserted, not the sufficiency of Methodism, but the sufficiency of the Gospel, to overcome them. Never did Methodism seem greater, because it was free from self-boasting; never so equipped for warfare, because its leaders are men of God; never so prophetically triumphant, because it is in alliance with Immanuel. It is the Church of the "holy seed," the chosen of God to bear divine messages to men. Without legislative functions it seemed as omnipotent as law, and without central authority it went forth, not so much into the past as into the future, shedding its light like the sweet influences of the Pleiades, binding the continents together in the Christ of history and redemption. Adieu! Nevertheless, all hail!

## THE CHURCH.

"I BELIEVE in the holy catholic, or universal, Church" is a phrase hoary with age, a part of the most ancient Christian symbol, and subscribed to by most men who profess to be followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. The word "church" is a household term, used by old and young, ignorant and learned, liberal and conservative; its definition is therefore first in order. Etymologically there is but little difficulty; for, like the Scotch *kirk*, German *kirche*, Old Saxon *kirika*, and similar forms in the various Teutonic dialects, the word is derived, without doubt, through the Low Latin from the Greek adjective *κυριακόν*—that is, the Lord's; with *δῶμα* understood, the Lord's house, or people gathered in such a place; just as we say House of Commons, or the Congress of the United States. It is, however, singular that *ἐκκλησία*, from *ἐκκαλέω*, to call together, and *κυριακόν*, is the New Testament designation for church. This is taken directly from classic Greek, where it is used in the sense of an assembly, especially one called together to transact any public business for the city or state. The Romanic and Celtic languages have retained the Greek *ἐκκλησία*, with the usual modifications incident to the various languages.

Let us now inquire into the meaning or object of the Church. It is not an organization of persons in any ordinary sense, banded together for æsthetical, literary, or even moral culture alone. Though the Church furnishes the highest culture, the most elevated taste, and the purest morality, yet it has a higher mission in the world. What is commonly denominated morality, viewed in the light of the Sermon on the Mount, is to Christianity what the moon is to the sun. The Christian Church is not a literary society where a cultured gentleman, learned in the humanities—a lover of literature, science, and art—may descant upon the beauties of Homer, Horace, Shakespeare, or Goethe, or may expound the profound philosophy of Plato, Bacon, or Kant, or may discuss the latest novel, political party, or even theological work. The Church of God has a grander and a nobler mission. It is well to cultivate good style, to develop the critical and æsthetical faculties, or to discuss political and sociological issues, but the pulpit which indulges largely in such practices, or the congregation which relishes such substitutes for the pure milk of the word, has not the correct idea of the divine origin of Christianity, or an adequate conception of the work it has to accomplish. When a minister ceases to make Christ the central figure of his preaching, and fails to point to the Lamb of God which takes away the sin of the world, and has no well-defined faith, disintegration is sure to follow. Theodore Parker's work in this country is a specimen of what an ill-balanced, or creedless, thinker can do. He despised the Church; he antagonized all the orthodox organizations then in existence; and in order to have, as we may suppose, at least one true Church, he organized what he called "The Twenty-eighth Congregational Society" of Boston, and while still professing to be a Christian minister "he emphatically repudiated all the fundamentals of Christianity." The sacraments were not adminis-

tered; he preached or lectured once every Sabbath upon some political, philosophical, literary, or theological topic. He attracted the crowds. Where to-day is the society which he founded? Freedom of speech, emancipation from traditions, and a hurling away of the shackles of orthodoxy are high-sounding phrases; but the iconoclasts who use them most are generally the enemies of progress, alike dangerous to State and Church. It is not always safe to set up our own judgments as supreme pontiff, and to trample down every thing human and divine if not in perfect harmony with our individual creed. The individual is more apt to err than the society or the church; and yet the heterodox continually carp about individual freedom in religious questions. George Putnam said, when he installed Mr. Fosdick pastor over Hollis Street Unitarian Church in Boston:

There is no other Christian body of which it is so impossible to tell where it begins and where it ends. We have no recognized principles by which any man who chooses to be a Christian disciple, and desires to be numbered with us, whatever he believes or denies, can be excluded.

Contempt for the opinions of the past is not a positive proof of a powerful mind or nobility of character. Celsus, Bolingbroke, Voltaire, Thomas Paine, and the leaders of the French Revolution are instances. A breaking loose from tradition, while it may remind us of the reformer, recalls also many who have been a curse to the race. This is true in Church and State. How often have these champions of innovation stranded the Church, if not in skepticism and agnosticism, yet on the cold sands of indifference? Individuality is commendable, but a Church without some organic union other than hatred for existing symbols or creeds will necessarily degenerate into a club which knows no limit for its reckless speculations. The Congregational churches of New England have suffered much from the pernicious effect of these so-called liberal tendencies. There can be no deep spirituality in a man who will subscribe to a creed and then deliberately interpret it in a way which perverts its original and intended meaning. Such a course is Jesuitical. This is what the rationalists did in the State Churches of Europe, and this, if indulged in, will not fail to introduce degeneration of spiritual life into the evangelical Churches of the United States. Were these modern reformers to follow Luther, Knox, and Wesley in one regard—that is, if they were to keep their eyes steadily upon Christ, were they filled with his Spirit, and were they constantly engaged in spreading his work—no great harm could come to the Church. However, as a matter of fact they evince more concern about textual criticism, more dexterity in discovering what they call contradictions or mistakes in the Bible, than they do of interest in saving souls.

We do not champion a blind adherence to exploded notions. We are not a friend to stagnation. We fully believe in continuous progress and constant development. We have no superstitious dread of seeing the old venerable bridges swept away by the currents of biblical criticism, whenever they can be replaced by more serviceable and permanent constructions. We have no desire to advocate old formulas, confessions, or eccle-

siastical politics, if they have nothing but age to recommend them. While we do not expect any new revelation from heaven we do certainly expect a clearer apprehension of the truths already revealed in the Bible. While willing to let reason have its legitimate course we can never forget that the Bible is the supreme court from which there is no appeal. There can be no Church, in the New Testament sense of the word, which regards the Holy Scriptures as subordinate to an individual or hierarchy. The rationalist and the Romanist meet at this point, and commit essentially the same blunder; the former believes what he pleases and rejects the rest, the latter believes what the pope believes and teaches *ex cathedrâ*.

The Roman Catholics assert that the Bible is subordinate to the living Church. The individual—the pope alone excepted—sinks out of sight. It is incomprehensible that a Church which so handicaps the individual can make such an exception in the case of one man, elevating him to superhuman heights and investing him with absolute infallibility. But lest we may misrepresent the Church of Rome we shall append its own deliverance on the subject. We quote from *Constitutio de Ecclesia*, c. iv.

We teach and define it to be a doctrine divinely revealed that when the Roman pontiff speaks *ex cathedrâ*, that is, when in the exercise of his office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, and in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines that a doctrine of faith and morals is to be held by the universal Church, he possesses, through the divine assistance promised him in the blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed, in defining a doctrine of faith and morals; and therefore that such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not by force of the consent of the Church thereto. . . . And if any one shall presume, which God forbid, to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema.

As Mr. Gladstone has well said, we can draw but little comfort from the phrase *ex cathedrâ*; for, though defined in twelve different ways, the pope alone can unquestionably declare *ex cathedrâ* what is *ex cathedrâ* and what is not. Such teaching is revolting, entirely at variance, not only with the Christian spirit of the present age, but with the New Testament as well. The same might be said of the Greek Church. It is also entirely unfitted for advanced civilization, and, like the Roman Catholic Church, fosters ignorance, and indirectly produces skepticism and hypocrisy.

The Anglican Church, followed by our own, defines the Church as follows :

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

It would be difficult to find a more comprehensive definition of the Church in so few words, or one less liable to objection. Most Protestant communions substantially agree with it; and the promise for a closer union is encouraging.

As the Christian Church was founded by our Saviour, and as the apostles, his first co-workers, were directly instructed by him, it would be well to inquire into the nature of the Church as far as we can learn from the New Testament. Our Lord, in answer to Pilate's question, "Art thou a

king, then?" said, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world." He proclaimed himself king; he summoned men to leave every thing and follow him. He does this, not as an ordinary rabbi, but as one having a right thereto. About the beginning of his ministry he summons twelve apostles, later a corps of seventy disciples. The twelve are henceforth to devote their entire time and energy to him; they must leave friends and relatives and follow him and learn of him, so that they might teach others concerning his kingdom. In two instances (Matt. xvi, 18, and xviii, 17) he designates his followers as "the Church." The usual designation, however, is kingdom—my kingdom, kingdom of God, kingdom of heaven. This is natural, for the Jew of that age could scarcely grasp the idea of a purely spiritual institution like the Christian Church. The words kingdom and church may not be synonymous; the latter, however, is included in the former. Our Lord teaches us to pray, "Thy kingdom come," and admonishes all to "seek first the kingdom of God," and declares that not every one who will say "Lord, Lord," shall enter the kingdom, but only those who are born anew. But, lest any might be misled, he declares plainly that his kingdom is not of this world, but that it is a spiritual institution organized to help God redeem the world and deliver it from spiritual thralldom.

The Church thus organized was not to be local, but catholic, or universal. Christianity is "to spread the inward, spiritual worship of God through all nations, in all stages of society, under all varieties of climate, of government, and condition." In harmony with this purpose, our Saviour after his resurrection commands his followers: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you;" and closes with the blessed assurance, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The mission of the Church under the apostles was to continue "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach." His absence is not real, for in spirit he is always with his followers. As Dr. Schaff has well said, "In the Church the Lord is perpetually born anew in the hearts of the believers through the Holy Ghost." Even before the crucifixion Christ had assured his disciples that he would never leave them comfortless, but would send them the Comforter, who would abide with them forever. Mindful of this promise we find the apostles and their followers—some one hundred and twenty in all—after the ascension gathered in an upper room at Jerusalem, continuing with one accord, in prayer and supplication, awaiting the descent of the Holy Ghost, who was to lead them into all truth. Pentecost came; thousands were converted and added to the numbers of the believers in Christ, the risen Lord. The Christian Church was now an established fact. Conversions were daily occurrences, and the converts were united together into churches, not only in Jerusalem and Palestine, but also in the regions around; so that we soon read of the churches of Syria, of Asia, the church at Antioch, the church of the Thessalonians, and even of churches organized



in private houses, as the church in the house of Aquila, of Philemon, and of Nymphas. The word church is not only used in this particular sense, but also in a general, as when we read that a great fear came upon the Church, or that Christ is the head of the Church, which is his body. Here no one particular church can be meant, but rather the Church in general.

It is not easy to determine with certainty what union existed between the separate churches of apostolic times. It is clear from the Acts and the several epistles that much liberty was enjoyed by the individual congregation in the enactment of laws for its own guidance. We must not, however, infer that every church was exclusively a law to itself in all matters, for the great commission was, that they should teach "them to observe all things whatever I (Christ) have commanded you." Faith in Christ, the crucified Saviour, the Redeemer from sin, was the essential thing, always insisted upon. Faith, according to Paul, is the "fundamental principle of Christian life." Every one must be saved through faith—faith in Christ, not in the Church. However, when men truly possess this faith there arises in them an insatiable thirst for communion, not only with God, but also with God's redeemed children; nay, more, an intense yearning to see all others surrender to the Son of God and obtain a like precious faith. Thus, organization is a necessity for the propagation of the conditions of salvation, and the Church a logical sequence. As long as the Church is pervaded with the spirit of saving men from sin it has but little to fear from heresy or schism. The most dangerous element in the Church of God is that which is allowed to supplant a burning desire to save souls, whether it be æsthetics, ecclesiasticism, agnosticism, or any species of infidelity or worldliness.

It is not strange that we have no definition of the word church in the New Testament, or any definite plan for organization, or a code of rules for the government of the Church, or even a formulated creed to which all must subscribe. Such things were lost sight of in the anxiety of the apostles to save souls and plant churches. The early Church, to some extent, must have been modeled after the synagogue, and it was natural that there should have been some conformity to Jewish usage. The Church, like the individual, will grow, making new conquests, adopting new methods in church-work and organization, and changing its government whenever greater efficiency may be secured. It is not bound to any form of government. It must adapt itself to the wants of every age, and accommodate its polity to the ever-changing conditions of society. "The rites and arrangements which suit one period lose their efficiency and significance in another." What suits one country may not be the best adapted to another; therefore the true lover of the Lord Jesus Christ should never insist upon non-essentials. There can be no stronger proof of the divinity of Christianity than its adaptation to the wants of all men, rich and poor, ignorant and learned, and its perfect fitness for all lands and times. When we remember the mission of Christianity we can readily see why more definite directions respecting government are not given in



the New Testament. While faith in Christ and conformity to his will have been required, and will continue to be required every-where, the mode of government and other minor matters are secondary, and ever subject to change. Had the Church kept this in mind in the past its progress would have been greater and more rapid, and controverted questions of government would not have been considered as important as doctrine.

The modern Protestant Church, with its manifold creeds and endless divisions, though greatly in advance of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and the Oriental Churches, is nevertheless not a perfect type of that of the New Testament. For this reason all true followers of the Lord Jesus Christ will encourage the growing tendency for a closer union, less of the purely denominational spirit, and a broader Christian fellowship. Dr. Schaff, in his *History of the Apostolic Church*, speaking of the typical import of that Church, refers to an opinion, first vaguely hinted at by Joachim of Flora, in the Middle Ages, but favored by Schelling, Neander, Ullmann, and other great philosophers and theologians of later times, namely, that "the three leading apostles, Peter, Paul, and John, are to be taken as types and representatives of so many ages of the Church, namely, the age of Catholicism, the age of Protestantism, and that of the *ideal Church of the future*." Gladstone's words are also apposite:

If the apostolic Church prophetically anticipates and foreshadows the whole course of history, the temporary collision of Peter, the apostle of circumcision, at Antioch, is a significant type of the antagonism between Romanism and Protestantism, the church of the binding law and the church of the free Gospel.

Peter, owing to his excessive leaning toward Judaism, was too one-sided to be the chief of the apostles, the chief pastor of the Christian Church, made up of sheep from various folds. The Lord had to replace him by a more liberal-minded man—by St. Paul, the apostle of freedom. And so in every age whenever a man does not follow the clear leading of Providence in matters of expediency, government, and methods of Christian activity he unfits himself for leadership both in Church and State. Every age has new duties and demands new methods, and the Church must be as alive as the age to which it belongs. In later days the Roman Catholic Church forfeited its claims to leadership on essentially the same grounds that Peter did, because it attempted to bind the individual conscience to dead formalities and traditions. But the early Church has lessons for Protestantism as well as for Catholicism: for, while the Catholic Church often has taken us back to the Jewish theocracy, viewing the Christian religion "under the aspect of legal authority and of objectivity," some branches of the Protestant Church have gone to the opposite extreme, for "in its zeal to purge the sanctuary it has demolished many a useful barrier, done manifold injustice to tradition and history. A remarkable analogy may be traced between the old pseudo-Pauline gnosticism and the fearful power of modern infidelity."

The Church of the future, while showing the broadest and most catholic spirit, must not allow itself "to be tossed to and fro and carried about

with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, in craftiness," after the wiles of error. It is an awful thing to cause a rupture in the body of Christ or to interfere with a healthful growth of the Church of the living God. The past should be our teacher. Many of the questions which disturb the Church to-day are old foes with new faces—questions settled, many of them, in the early ages of Christianity. The advanced wing of higher criticism, especially in the United States, only echoes exploded theories whose origin may be traced to the brains of some German rationalist. For it is well known that a scientific or philosophical development of these destructive systems has found its greatest advocates in the Protestant universities of Germany, a country where experimental religion is at a very low ebb. These men, as Dr. Schaff points out, "appeal to the Reformation for the right to protest against Christ and his apostles, as formerly Marcion and the Gnostics appealed to Paul."

The modern Protestant Church in this country has more formidable foes in these destructive critics than in Romanism. There is an air of learning and candor about them which is most fascinating to the undisciplined mind not well grounded in philosophy, as well as to the cold unregenerate heart not washed in the blood of the Lamb, while the gross assumptions of Rome are revolting to the practical and enlightened American. The Church of the future, while turning away with pity from the extreme sacerdotalism and monkish inventions of Rome, must at the same time cling closer to the doctrines of Christ and the apostles as revealed in the word of God, and contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints. The Church has invariably suffered whenever it has yielded to rationalistic tendencies. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Like will produce like in the nineteenth and twentieth as well as in all preceding centuries. Universalism, Unitarianism, and other forms of so-called free thought have never deepened the piety of the Church nor increased its zeal for the promulgation of the Gospel of Christ. Take away the idea of the absolute necessity for regeneration and sanctification, the utility of prayer, and a firm belief in the Bible as the inspired word of God which contains all things necessary to salvation—take away these or any one of them, and the Church must inevitably suffer. Let the people be taught from our pulpits or professorial chairs to disbelieve the above doctrines or to make light of the Bible, and they will soon learn to do without any kind of church organization. The safety of the Church is conditioned on its faith in the Bible as the word of God; the influence of the Bible is conditioned on its regnancy in the thought and affections of the Church. The Church without the Bible dies; the Bible without the Church sleeps..

### PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION.

---

IS REPUBLICANISM the ideal form of government? To the ordinary American, surrounded from his birth with New World institutions and trained in the exercise of the highest rights of citizenship, the question seems easy of answer. The history of the republic, with its glowing pages of yeoman struggle and of later successes, is to him a sufficient refutation of any reflection cast upon his governmental constitution and practice. The history of other republics also, as those of the Netherlands and of Switzerland, is equally confirmatory of the excellences claimed for this form of government. To the political student, however, the evils that inhere in republicanism, if they be different from the defects discoverable in the monarchical or oligarchal order, are nevertheless definite and grave. The whole system of American politics, for illustration, seems fraught with tremendous possibilities of danger to national perpetuity. In the very frequency of our elections is lodged a weighty peril. Some municipal, state, or national officer is always to be chosen. The voice of the candidate is ever heard upon the hustings in importunity for votes; the din of the parade fills the streets; the bluster and brag of the campaign leaders crowd the columns of the daily prints. Men's prejudices by these means are kept at white heat; oftentimes their better judgments are subordinated to partisan interests; repeatedly the weighty concerns of society are jeopardized for selfish ends. If frequency of elections be the proud boast of republics—if thereby the tendency to centralization of power is checked and the promotion of lowly-born citizens to the higher offices of the government is made possible—there may nevertheless be an over-frequency in the exercise of suffrage which does not make for national prosperity.

The quality of the pseudo-statesmanship which engages most actively in our political campaigns is furthermore to be deprecated. Too true is the claim that the better citizenship of the land is indifferent to the theories of the great political parties, refuses consent to nomination for office, and refrains especially from the exercise of the supreme right of the free-man upon the day of election. One noteworthy difference between British and American practice, according to the definition of an observing visitor lately on our shores, is that in England the best men engage in politics and in America the worst. So it is that those of few qualifications and of unworthy aims too often crowd into our lower and even higher elective offices; while occasionally those better fitted who are chosen find themselves trammelled by party expectations of spoils and by unwritten requirements of subserviency to the faction that has accomplished their election. The possibility of subverting the results of a specific election, through the plottings of chief leaders and the illegal acts of returning boards, is furthermore predictive of the gravest peril for republican institutions. Dispassionately, and with no specific reference to any instance that has of

late come under the public notice, it is pertinent to remark upon this tendency and its peril. Not moral qualifications, nor party affiliation, nor intellectual equipment, but the application of the common rules of arithmetic must decide the occupancy of an elective office if government is to be long maintained. The bitter partisanship which would consent to the violation of the statute law for short-lived advantage throws open the door of opportunity through which disorder, anarchy, disruption, will soon enter with willing feet. Because of the constant political debate that is waging, sometimes prompting the notion of the superiority of monarchies with their more fixed institutions, and because of the nearness of another presidential contest with its warring voices, this line of remark seems appropriate. It is not enough, as optimists hold, that none of the evils specified have increased in many years of national history. If republicanism makes for intelligence and virtue there should have been a positive decrease in political chicanery, in bribery, in vote-buying and selling, in greed for spoils. The trend seems toward disaster, and if these and a score of other evils that threaten the governmental life be considered, to every political student they prompt the question as to the ultimate fate of republican government.

---

THE new cure for drunkenness, which is now agitating the medical and scientific worlds, challenges the notice of every friend of fallen humanity. With the enthusiastic claims of the defenders of the bichloride of gold treatment our readers are perforce acquainted, and need no full definition of the theory and its application. To the exultant testimonies also of patients who have undergone the Keeley treatment and claim full liberation from the drink bondage we cannot be deaf in this hour of their triumphant witness-bearing. If we accept the claim of enthusiasts as to the value of the alleged discovery, a new star of hope has risen upon the drunkard's night. Or if we receive the verdict of conservative judges who wait for a fuller trial of the theory, at least a possible escape is opened up for the victim of intoxicants. Leaving, however, the Keeley theory to the test of time, which tries all things good and bad in its alembic, its relations to the moral phases of the drink habit claim particular notice. We do not understand, though the treatment should prove for the drunkards of the generation all that its confident discoverer expects, that the ethics of liquor-selling or of liquor-drinking would be thereby changed. No anathema upon drunkenness which is written in the Book would as a consequence be stricken from the holy oracles. Liquor would still be that fiend with inherent power to sap the physical vitality, to enslave the will, to sear the conscience, to inflame the bestial passions, to steal away life's great opportunities, and to rob the soul of paradise. The organized liquor manufacture of the world would also continue to be that monstrous traffic for which the eternities have no forgiveness. Let it not be thought that Mr. Keeley has come with a new evangel of liberty for men, abrogating the moral law, reducing drunkenness to a peccadillo, and

promising full restoration from intemperate courses for every drunkard. Whatever relief the new discovery may bring to the besotted, it can never rob his vice of its moral quality while the world endures.

Furthermore, the bichloride treatment becomes at the best but an adjunct of divine grace to redeem the drunkard. What Christianity has done in this respect the annals well prove. Though some have fallen who have claimed supernatural support, they have disproved no Christian theory of the almighty help nor invalidated men's confidence that in this is the supreme remedy for alcoholism. Chemistry can never take the place of divine grace in men's struggles for victory over the archenemy. Still further, the bichloride cure, if it should prove all that men dream, would not relieve philanthropists from that loving and untiring system of rescue work which marks the close of the century. There would yet be the need of missions among the fallen, the ministry of charity to the helpless inmates of the drunkard's home, the spread of temperance literature, the maintenance of inebriates' institutions, the insistence upon more rigid temperance legislation, and, in fine, the manifold lines of work which consecrated hearts have already undertaken. The bichloride cure, at the best, could only be numbered among these agencies of good, rather than be expected to supplant them all. To hold that one scientist has discovered the cure-all for the gravest disease that has afflicted the race, and that he alone is to be the saviour of the world of drunkards, would be to foist an absurdity upon the notice of the age. For the fullest proof of the value of the Keeley cure it is the part of patience to wait. Whether it is to be numbered with such semi-successes as the Pasteur system of inoculation, or whether it will take its place among irrational and exploded theories like the recently advertised "elixir" of Brown-Sequard, time will determine. But though the discovery prove of the largest value it has supplanted no established law of personal obligation. Vigilance is still the price to be paid for liberty. Every temperate soul is still his "brother's keeper" among the snares and pitfalls that are spread for human feet. These are eternal verities whose authority is on high.

---

THE insurrection in Brazil must be added to the already numerous tragedies that have been played by the South American nations. Many of the environments which make for success surround the Brazilian government. In extent it possesses the largest territory of any State in South America. In location it touches every country of the continent except Chili to the west, thus maintaining open avenues of approach to its industrial markets. With a sea-coast of nearly four thousand miles it can send forth its exports to every nation of the world. In fertility of soil it may well be the envy of many of the barren and rock-bound countries of northern latitudes. Of mineral and vegetable products it includes in its bewildering list gold and diamonds, iron, salt, coffee, cotton, sugar, cocoa, rice, dyes, rosewood, and many commodities besides. Enjoying such a largess of natural gifts, Brazil is surely the *El Dorado* which the Castilians sought. What,

then, is the meaning of the Brazilian unrest, whose latest manifestation is in grave insurrectional disturbances? It does not necessarily follow that the Republic is dissatisfied with its new governmental experiment and wishes a return to the empire, with its throne and state. Since the quite recent disenthronement of Dom Pedro and his virtual banishment, the time has been too short to learn the merits or discover the defects of the new system. Is there not rather inherent in the Brazilian character many of the traits of other tropic nations which do not contribute to greatness? Familiar is the charge upon these southern peoples of a deep-seated and incurable restlessness, a constitutional intolerance of existing institutions, and a visionary expectation of advantages to be gained from change. That the northern nations are less mercurial, more patient workers for success, more submissive to existing forms as a means to wealth and prestige, the philosophy of national life will show. In close connection with which feature is the further fact, of incidental value, that the nations of the temperate zones have been the achieving nations of the world. If Egypt, Carthage, and Persia once filled a large place in the annals of achievement, the general rule is not invalidated. If the Orient gave the God-man to the world and Genoa sent forth one of her sailors to find a new hemisphere, it is yet the men of northern birth who rank the highest in invention, science, military leadership, and letters. To this fact of tropical characteristics may therefore be attributed in part the Brazilian disposition to unrest. Because of this national temper emperors have reigned, some short-lived Fonseca as dictator comes and goes upon the stage, or a provisional junta in turn seizes the reins of power.

The disturbing effects of ignorance may also be enrolled among the possible causes of the Brazilian restlessness. With a population of several millions the lack of educational advantages, perhaps with the consent of a dominating and scheming priesthood, is one of the admitted features of the Brazilian life. Some of its component parts, as Negroes, Mulattoes, and aboriginal Indians, for whom instruction would seem especially fit and necessary, go untutored in the ways of knowledge, and injury can only follow. Whatever other benefits result from the presence of the academy and university in the national midst it surely follows that education helps to the best citizenship. From acquaintance with the science of government, the perusal of the deeds of ancestral heroes, and the study of science and *belles-lettres*, the most intelligent citizens and the bravest patriots are made. The large absence of all this in the Brazilian life may in part furnish the explanation we seek; to which must be added the adverse influences of the dominant religion in Brazil. Without wishing to speak the language of the bigot, it is not clear that the Roman Catholic governments of the world are the most stable and progressive. Protestantism only seems to afford an enduring basis for governmental life. Additional to all which considerations the schemes of designing men, gifted with some of the showy qualities of leadership, may further explain the insurrectional spirit and its outbursts which come as disturbing tidings from the southern world.

## THE ARENA.

## THE BENEFIT OF THE DOUBT.

It is a fundamental axiom of jurisprudence that the benefit of the doubt that may arise in the investigation of any particular case shall always be given to the party or cause under arraignment. The propriety and equity of this position has never been successfully assailed.

This principle of common law, because it is fair, just, and honorable, should extend to all cases, in and out of court, that may come before the judicial faculty of the human mind or the bar of public opinion for final adjudication. That there will be doubts, differences, and apparent contradictions is obvious. These will spring from a multiplicity of causes, such as incomplete data, superficial inquiry, prejudice, and preconceived notions. When any or all of these factors enter into a case to unduly magnify or minify the facts, the impartial judge or jury will take proper cognizance of them, and render a verdict in accordance therewith.

Let us subsidize the principle above enunciated and employ the same in behalf of the Holy Scriptures. To say that the "word of God" is on trial is the veriest truism. From its inception even until now each age has either had it under arrest or in banishment. The nineteenth century is no exception. To-day the Bible is solemnly arraigned. It is charged with diverse and manifold discrepancies; its facts questioned; its doctrinal position challenged; its scientific deliverances pronounced false. Now, in a careful search after the truth or the untruth of these charges, some points of evidence will, of necessity, be vague and obscure; others warped and one-sided. Some of these points will make for the Scriptures, while others will militate against them. It is clear, then, that the weighing of this testimony and the giving it its proper value as such will demand skill and ability of no mean order, and tax to the uttermost the analytic and logical powers of the loftiest intellect.

When, for example, the accuracy of the Mosaic account of creation is denied on the one side, and the correctness of the geologic period affirmed on the other side, it is self-evident that the hand which holds the scales of justice must be steady and firm, and that the mind which balances and tests the proofs must be unbiased, or we shall have a decision that will be totally and absolutely untrustworthy.

Again, if it shall be found, after a careful and critical traversing of the evidence, *pro* and *con*, that there is not a preponderance in support of the geologic record, then either the old Scotch verdict of "not proven" must be rendered, or in all fairness the benefit of the doubt be accorded to the Mosaic narrative.

The reason for our taking this position may be stated in few words. The Bible is not a manual of science. Its writers do, nevertheless, touch incidentally upon scientific topics. Its record of creation is the *oldest* extant. Moreover, it is an inspired record. As such it speaks with



authority. Geology, on the other hand, is a human science, and like all things human it bears upon it strong and unmistakable marks of fallibility. Its most devoted patrons concede that it has not yet attained perfection, but confess that some of its premises are unproved and some of its depositions incomplete. As a science it is still in its nonage, as already demonstrated at the late Geological Congress held in Washington, D. C. When its majority is reached, if that time shall ever come, it seems more than probable that the testimony of the rocks will corroborate the story of Genesis. Until then we can well afford, whether the contradictions and disagreements are harmonized or no, to invite a flash-light investigation after the truth, at the same time holding fast to the oldest and most reliable account at hand. This principle might be further elucidated by numerous other citations from both parties to the controversy. Enough, however, has been said to clearly illustrate the practice we advocate in dealing with *all* biblico-scientific subjects.

It seems to have become somewhat popular of late, in certain theological quarters, to accept without protest any charge made by science against the Bible as true. Whatever the motives underlying this movement and actuating its leaders, it is too painfully evident that the actions of certain men are grossly inconsistent with their callings and incompatible with their professions. Their sudden abandonment of revealed truth seems like cowardice, or treason, or both. What, for instance, permits so strange an anomaly—more strange and irreconcilable than any issue now pending between revelation and science—as to see men who by reason of the public office they hold are the recognized defenders of the truth once delivered to the saints, as soon as any point in controversy is not sun-clear giving up their case without even entering a *caveat* or attempting to prove a *non-sequitur*?—men who ingloriously surrender to every doughty champion who has the temerity and audacity to throw down the gauntlet of war, collapsing into their boots at the first bugle-blast that calls to the conflict, and giving up the ghost before a thrust is parried or a blow for victory struck? These men are like Mephistopheles in Goethe's *Faust*; they are possessed with a spirit of *negative*, instead of being filled, and that constantly, with a spirit of affirmative. They give more credence and prominence to their doubts than they do to their beliefs. Called to be positive qualities in the promulgation of the Holy Scriptures and the exposition of the same, they are minus signs, or at most interrogation points. Christianity has more to fear from such so-called friends than she has from her most vigilant and bitter foes. Nominally within the camp of her followers, they are *de facto* outside thereof. Their swords, unsheathed for truth, flash out against it. Like sappers, they undermine the foundations; and it is pertinent to ask, "If the foundations be destroyed what can the righteous do?" Let him answer who can.

It remains to be added that the only consistent course for Christians to pursue in all matters of disagreement between the declarations of God's word and the findings of science is—unless there is an overwhelming array of evidence to the contrary—to give the benefit of the doubt to the

Scriptures, and assume that they are *right* until they are proved wrong. Then in a frank and ingenuous spirit await further developments. If these developments shall be in the direction of clearer demonstration and a fuller vindication of the accuracy of the divine word, well and good; but if not, when facts well authenticated and well established are against it, it will then be time, and not till then, to make an honorable capitulation, and, since there remains no further ground for doubt, to acknowledge the Scriptures to be in error and science right. *We anticipate, however, that in the final analysis the converse will obtain.*

Cape Vincent, N. Y.

CHARLES SHEARD.

#### A CENTURY OF NEW YORK METHODISM.

OF late years much has been said and written about the decadence of Methodism in this good city of New York. Its dying condition has been so often dinged into my ears that I could almost fancy that nothing of it is left to us but its ghost. Still my hopeful spirit would cry out ever and anon, "I don't believe it." You know, Mr. Editor—or if you do not know it you ought to—that there exists among us a proverb that "figures wont lie;" so I betook myself, with much of dread, I confess, but not totally in despair, to figures; and that not to figures of speech—"airy nothings"—but to stubborn, downright facts, as given in dull, dry reports; and behold, the ghost has become a living body, and the supposed dry bones are clothed with a tolerable amount of flesh and muscle, and possessed by a fairly vigorous spirit—not, perhaps, having the robust, rollicking health of its earlier youth, but still strong and willing to do battle in the cause of the Lord of hosts. New York Methodism is neither dead nor dying.

The evidence I adduce of this is a statement of facts, which any one who will take the trouble to investigate may corroborate for himself. And that I may not be accused of an attempt to pervert the testimony of these proverbially true witnesses, and make them speak falsely, I will let them tell their own story. Will you listen to their testimony? They shall speak every tenth year of New York Methodist history from 1790 down to the present.

In 1790 the population of the city of New York was 33,131; the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the city was 624; being 1 and a fraction to every 53 of the inhabitants. For convenience of statement I drop the fractions.

In 1800 the population was 60,489; the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church was 776; being 1 in 77—a gain in membership of 152, though not keeping up with the increase of population.

In 1810 the population was 96,373; the membership of the Church 2,200; being 1 in 43. This was our most prosperous decade.

In 1820 the population was 123,786; the membership of the Church was 2,528; being 1 in 48 of the people.

In 1830 the city population was 202,589; the church membership 3,955; being 1 in every 50 of the inhabitants.

In 1840 the population was 312,710; the membership of our Church in the city was 5,778; being 1 in 54 of population. From this point onward the ratio of the population increased faster than did that of the membership of the Church.

In 1850 the population of the city was 515,547; the church membership 8,676; being 1 in 59.

In 1860 the population ran up to 805,659; the membership of the Church was 11,226; being 1 in 71.

In 1870 the population was 942,392; membership of Church 13,296; being 1 in 70.

In 1880, with a population of 1,206,299, the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church in New York city was 15,621; being 1 in 97.

In 1890 the population of the city was 1,513,501; the membership of our Church within the city limits, 15,350; being 1 in 98.

About A. D. 1819 or 1820 the colored members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in New York were, at their own request, set off and formed a religious organization of their own. The following year the Stilwell secession took place, carrying off, perhaps, 300 white members. Thus about 1,000 members, all of whom, being counted in the tables of population, should, in order to a fair comparative showing, be allowed for. These secessions account for the reduction in the next decade.

It may be of interest to some to show at a glance the numerical advance or loss of Methodism in the city in the several decades. It is given in the following paragraph:

Starting in 1790 with the before-mentioned 624 members, in 1800 the membership was 776, a gain of but 152. In 1810 the membership was 2,200, a gain of 1,424. In 1820 membership stood at 2,528, a gain of but 328. In 1830 the membership was 3,955, a gain of 1,427. In 1840 membership was 5,778, a gain of 1,823. In 1850 the membership was 8,676, being a gain of 2,898. In 1860 the membership was 11,226, a gain of 2,550. In 1870 the membership was 13,296, a gain of 2,070. In 1880 the membership was 15,621, a gain of 2,325. In 1890 the membership as reported was 15,350, a loss of 271. We are thankful to state that the ground lost has been recovered, the Minutes of 1891 showing a gain over those of 1880 of 480.

The compiler of these statistics is not, however, vain of their showing. They furnish ground of humiliation, but not of despondency. Let the Church weigh well these figures, and, carrying them on its heart, let it have immediate recourse to its Master, and while it shall present to him its showing with shamefacedness and deep humiliation for the result, let it consecrate its energies anew to carry forward the work intrusted to it to a far-advanced position. Yet, considering the very heavy influx into the city in late years of foreigners whom, because of differences of language and habits, and especially of religious prejudices, Methodism is as yet utterly unable to affect to any perceptible degree, the compiler thinks the retrospect is by no means disheartening.

JOSEPH LONGKING.

*New York, N. Y.*

## CAN THE DEITY SUFFER?

IN our fears of anthropomorphism we are in danger of robbing God of his personality. Why should not the Deity suffer? The objection is founded on the supposition that happiness is necessarily an attribute of infinity and goodness. Why may not the infinite Father choose to suffer? Does not love love to suffer for the good of others?

But, then, would not love neutralize the suffering? No, for while the act of suffering may be chosen with willingness, and even with intense delight, the pain of suffering can never be delightful in itself.

But can infinity be limited in any direction without being less than infinite? Yes; there are degrees of infinity, as may be shown by mathematical demonstration; but, not to dwell on such abstractions, even the attributes of Deity are not all infinite. Certainly *justice* is not; only perfect; evenly balanced. Even *love* is not; it is limited by its objects—their nature, their needs, their deserts. God's *holiness* is not infinite, though absolutely perfect. Infinite holiness is inconceivable. Why then insist on infinite happiness? Why suppose an infinite supply of that which is not an element of goodness but only a result?

The Scripture argument is unanswerable. The word every-where reveals God as being pleased or displeased—not a mechanical, cast-iron Deity. The *atonement* was a human work if only the humanity of Christ suffered. It is said, "His divinity sympathized with his humanity." If so, it must have suffered; for sympathy implies suffering. If it did not suffer in any sense of the word, then what share could it possibly have in the redemptive work?

God "*gave*" his Son. This implies self-sacrifice on the part of the Father, as well as suffering on the part of the Son; else God would seem to be less tender than earthly fathers. Man, the image of the divine being, cannot utterly belie his Creator. God not only fills his universe but thrills it with life and love, and is himself thrilled with hatred for sin and pity for suffering, as well as joy in righteousness.

"This, this is the God we adore."

Conshohocken, Pa.

T. M. GRIFFITH.

## DR. BRISTOL AND ST. MARK.

WE all agree that Dr. Bristol's article on Mark is strong in many features, but is he correct in his statement as to Mark's being the most artistic gospel? In my humble judgment it is not up to the standard of Luke, but is out of proportion and inartistic, if not uncouth. There is duality in his expression; he uses many vulgarisms forbidden by Greek standards. This is strong evidence of its early writing, since these blemishes are eliminated by Matthew and Luke later on. See v, 23; ii, 4, 9, 11, 12; ix, 47; xi, 15; xiv, 65.

Eureka, Kan.

J. W. WRIGHT.

## THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.

## THE PREACHER AND SERMON-BUILDING.

IN previous numbers of the *Review* we promised to say more on the subject of sermon-building. Indeed, what thus far has been said is chiefly destructive, not constructive; and he is a poor critic or instructor who does nothing but tear things in pieces. "That bee is uncivil which stings and makes no honey."

Our first suggestion as to sermon-building is this: The successful sermonizer must be a good man. The position is easily defensible, that in proportion as the preacher is in right relations with himself, with his fellow-men, and with his Creator, other things being equal, will be the perfection of his sermon-building. If the preacher's aims are selfish, or if he is hungrier for popular applause than for the souls of his people, his intellectual faculties will wizen and his sermons will be of the lean kind. He will get the parsonage to live in, perhaps, and his bread and butter, but no more. On the other hand, the stimulation that comes from a good life and from a lofty purpose to honor God and benefit mankind energizes all the intellectual faculties, and even rejuvenates them. The mind under such stimulation outdoes itself; it can run without weariness and walk without faintness.

But it is asked if all successful literary workers are good men, and if the mere literary work on the sermon cannot be well done even if the man is not good, or if not swayed by a lofty moral purpose. Our reply is, that the literary part of a sermon is far from being the whole of it.

We are aware that Hume, Gibbon, Lord Byron, Voltaire, Thomas Paine, Robert Ingersoll, and several others are held up as examples of successful literary men who have antagonized in theory, and some of them in practice, the principles of goodness as taught in the Bible.

We can think of no Methodist preacher so highly endowed that he can hope for permanent success unless goodness lies at the basis of his character.

Gibbon's insincerity and licentious thought have long since been his condemnation, though in possession of natural qualifications in some respects unequalled. Byron's genius was transcendent, but his bad thought and life were well-nigh his ruin. These men, and others like them, would not have met any measure of success if their talents had been ordinary. In the congress of ages men are voted down unless they are good men, and unless they teach and write in harmony with the ethics of eternity. Any thing self-degrading, injurious to man physically, mentally, morally, or any thing impious, or any thing antagonistic to the common judgment of Christendom (when Christendom is biblical), or any thing issuing from a bad heart, (for how can sweet waters flow from bitter fountains?) will not be tolerated. A thunder-bolt is at the breast of the man who is wrong in his life and in his words.

It may not be out of place to dwell a moment longer on this thought.

The names pre-eminent in poetry are Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, and Milton; the names pre-eminent in music are Mozart, Handel, Haydn, and Beethoven; the names pre-eminent in ornamental art are Michael Angelo, Raphael, and Rubens; the names pre-eminent in oratory are Demosthenes, Pericles, and Cicero, and, in our own country, Webster, Clay, and Phillips; the names pre-eminent in national affairs are Washington, Lincoln, and Grant.

As we look through this list we find men who were not perfect—few men are perfect—but we find not one who was not religious, some of them eminently so. We find not one whose productions were aimed against Bible truth and the public good; and those productions of theirs which have the firmest hold on the world are those which harmonize with the common judgment of Christendom when Christendom is biblical.

We give two incidents that let us into the secret of many a man's power and success. When Wendell Phillips was fourteen years of age he heard Lyman Beecher preach a sermon in which were these words: "Young man, you belong to God." The youth went to his room, locked the door, threw himself on the floor, and before he left the room was enabled to say, "O God, I do belong to thee." That thought, and others awakened by it, were no doubt the secret of the noble life and the wonderful power of Wendell Phillips.

John G. Whittier was at one time the editor of the *New England Review*, a Whig publication. He was called on to reply to an attack made by William Lloyd Garrison on Mr. Clay for being a slave-holder. Mr. Whittier had completed his reply just as his friend, Mr. Morgan, entered the office. Mr. Whittier seemed greatly agitated. He handed the manuscript to Mr. Morgan, with the request that he should look it over at his leisure. When it was returned Mr. Whittier asked Mr. Morgan how he liked the article. He replied that it was a most admirable and complete response to the great agitator's argument. Mr. Whittier then took the manuscript in his hands and tore it into fragments, remarking, with the intensest feeling, "Mr. Morgan, I cannot enter into controversy with that man. He has God's eternal truth on his side."

If the preacher would have his intellectual faculties work at their best—if he would build sermons worthy to be called such—let him first of all be a good man, consecrated to God and intent on benefiting his fellow-men. Such is the first preparation for sermon-building.

---

#### THE SELECTION OF BOOKS TO READ.

WE closed a previous article on the above topic with the suggestion that as to the selection of books every person in his own breast has a guide of much value.

If this is true, then manifestly the standards of choice and of rejection are not and cannot be the same with all persons, nor the same with a given person at all times.

"Do you read novels?" said a bright young lady to a lawyer.

"I did," was the reply, "until my experience surpassed the wildest romance."

Of course, that lawyer's tastes and instincts henceforth would guide him to other fields than romance for his reading. And as a rule we may say that the craving for light literature does not last, provided one is not reading pernicious books.

Extending through a series of many years it has been found that four fifths of the books taken from the Harvard College library by freshmen are works of fiction, while the sophomores take but two fifths fiction, the juniors and seniors but one fifth, the remaining four fifths being about equally divided between essays, biography, history, and poetry. This would indicate strongly that as a rule the taste for fiction is initiatory—a step only in a journey.

To some minds no book on earth is of so great importance as the Bible. Its histories, its biographies, its prophecies, its doctrinal discourses, its scheme of redemption, and its many other revelations make it the book of books—the one book. So said Sir Walter Scott, and so have thought a multitude of others. But not all think thus. In the meantime, it will do no good to be impatient with the one who does not prefer the reading of the Bible to that of all other books.

It is said that the first thing which the philosopher Zeno did on reaching Athens from Cyprus was to go to an Attic book-stall and purchase the writings of Xenophon. Only a few people, however, would have made that their first business on reaching Athens.

Benjamin Franklin tells us that Cotton Mather's *Essays to Do Good*, though tattered and torn, with several leaves missing, afforded him indescribable delight in his boyhood, and had a molding influence on all his after-life. A boy of singular taste! is the exclamation of not a few.

The late F. W. Robertson, one of the most brilliant of preachers, writes thus: "I turn aside from merely inviting books, but Plato, Aristotle, Butler, Thucydides, Sterne, and Jonathan Edwards have passed like the iron atoms of the blood into my mental constitution." Only a few preachers put such tonic as this into their blood.

Mr. Emerson somewhere has said that *Plutarch* and *Montaigne* are books on which he fed in his youth with irresistible attraction. But not a few youths would starve to death on that kind of diet. These men, Zeno, Franklin, Robertson, Emerson, and others like them belong, it is apparent, to an exceptional class. What they can do, others for the present cannot, but the cases illustrate certain points. Though a limited list of books which is adapted to all classes cannot be made, still the reading of such books as one takes an interest in will cultivate the reading taste, and lead to a choice of books of a high and unexceptionable character. The direction to every person to read at once Xenophon's *History*, Cotton Mather's *Essays*, Plutarch's *Lives*, Butler's *Analogy*, Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*, Carlyle's *French Revolution*, Sharp's *Culture and Religion*, etc., is as unwise as to require every man to wear a ten-inch hat.



But this should be borne in mind, that people who cannot to-day read books of the class just referred to may do so with delight and even enthusiasm a year or more hence. The reading with pleasurable zest of one unvicious book, though of the light literature class, starts one on the way of mastering the world's best books; for the reading taste has begun its development the moment a decent book gives pleasure.

In view of all these considerations we venture the statement that any person in our itinerant club who has little or no taste or relish for reading may choose for the present that which passes for light (not vile) literature. Is this heterodoxy? We hope not.

Let us not be misunderstood. We make a most uncompromising war on bad books. A bad book is a bandit in society. Indeed, no name or epithet is severe enough for it. A public censor, wise and possessed of autocratical power, should be commissioned to enter the temples of literature and with a whip of small cords mercilessly drive from their stalls and lurking-places all these foul beasts and foul birds, until not one is left to prey upon their unsuspecting victims. John Milton's recommendation is, "to confine and imprison all bad books, and do sharpest justice on them as malefactors."

Having ruled out of our list all books whose tendencies are low and bad we are in position to make an application of the foregoing thoughts. There are in our itinerant clubs young men who have had comparatively no educational advantages. They have been called from workshops or farms to the circuit, or to out-of-the-way appointments. There has been as yet no taste for reading of the higher sort; at least this is true comparatively speaking—there have been no opportunities for such cultivation. It is easier for such persons to talk than to read; gossip is the easiest kind of talk. Some of the difficult parts of our Conference Course of Reading is a horror to the class of which we are speaking. It must, then, be apparent that what these young men need is the cultivation of a love for reading; and the initial step may be light literature. It is true that such reading is only one of the lower rounds of an ascending ladder; but our point is this, that the young men we have in mind are more likely to climb well up the ladder if they step on that lower round than they are if they stand on street corners with their hands in their pockets, or join their interests with those of the great army of gossipers and tale-bearers. The hope we have, and it is a well-grounded one, is that if the young men we have in mind will read something, say the *Arabian Nights* (there are those who may be glad to know that so distinguished a man as Horne Tooke has said, "I read the *Arabian Nights* once every two years"), or if they read the *Old Curiosity Shop*, or some of the fictions of Cooper or of Gronig, and read with interest, the day is not distant when there will be delight in the reading of the *Lady of the Lake* or of the *Vicar of Wakefield* or of the descriptive poems of Whittier, Longfellow, and Bryant. Then Gronig's *Life of Washington*, Franklin's *Autobiography*, Prescott's *Conquest of Mexico*, and Livingstone's *African Travels* will soon be found in their hands. And when this stage is reached we

may say that a taste for reading is fast developing, and soon the light literature will cease to interest. The rare editions of Shakespeare, Xenophon's writings, Butler's *Analogy*, are the ones on which the reader, after a time, will begin to feast.

---

#### THE ART OF CONSTRUCTING MATERIALS INTO A SERMON— THE LOGIC OF SERMON-BUILDING.

##### I. *Preliminary Thoughts.*

##### 1. Objections to logical arrangement.

- (1) It ties the mind down as to a task.
- (2) It leads to dry and didactic development.

##### 2. The advantages of logical arrangement may be inferred—

- (1) In that all noted writers urge it.
- (2) In that there is logical arrangement in all God's laws.
- (3) In the aid afforded to the speaker. Consciousness of correct logical arrangement affords power.
- (4) In the aid afforded the hearer.

##### 3. By transcendentizing materials. Continued meditation gives transcendentalization.

##### 4. By sanctification of materials. This depends on:

- (1) Moral and religious character and endowments of the preacher.
  - (2) He must preach to them as if he knew them.
  - (3) The aim of the preacher—edification and soul-saving.
  - (4) The relation the preacher sustains to Christ and the Atonement.
- 

#### THE YOUNG PREACHER AND THE FIELD OF KNOWLEDGE.

WHEN the preacher in the early years of his ministry reaches a point where the immense fields of knowledge are beginning to come under his view, and he realizes how little of it all he has mastered, and what in our day is expected of the preacher, he is in danger of despair, or, at least, of discouragement. How can he fulfill the obligations pressing upon him? How can he know any thing of all things or all things of any thing?

Take breath, young friend. Do not let the many tasks, or your own deficiencies, hurry you; for hurry is a great waste of time, besides being ill-mannered. Bear in mind, too, that the natural world, or the world of knowledge, cannot be circumnavigated in a day. Suppose one cannot become acquainted with all the facts of science, or with all the truths of philosophy, or with all the lore of literature, still one should not forget that "partial knowledge is better than total ignorance." By diligence one may add something to one's stock of available knowledge and sermonic materials during almost every wakeful hour. In a few years, by continuous and patient application, one need have no shame or fear before even the most intelligent congregation.

**FOREIGN RÉSUMÉ.****SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.****H. VON SODEN, OF BERLIN.**

AMONG the younger theologians, and of the more "liberal" in tendency, Von Soden is rapidly taking rank. His method is rigidly scientific. For example, while he does not deny the Messiahship of Christ, nor Christ's consciousness of his relationship to God, yet he explains in a good measure the Messianic consciousness of Jesus from his surroundings and from events in his history. He thinks that Christ busied himself at Nazareth with the current apocalyptic books of his day, and became imbued with their principal ideas. His consciousness that he was the Messiah thus foretold awoke first at, and because of, his baptism by John. His previous studies and this event fitted into each other and produced his Messianic consciousness. But Von Soden is so thoroughly scientific that he almost ceases to be scriptural. For instance, he asserts that Jesus's conception of his Messiahship was not much influenced by the thought of his sinlessness, his pre-existence, and his power to perform miracles. His idea was not to fix a place for himself in the esteem of mankind, but to introduce the kingdom of God as he experienced it in his own person. Hence little stress is to be laid upon the names applied to Christ either by himself or by others. Not these names, but his work, reveal the Christ to us. This is a most ingenious attack upon the divinity of Christ. We have in Jesus a product of evolution. The self-abnegation which Von Soden here justly attributes to our Lord is made the subtle means of denying his real nature. As in all the "liberal" theologians, so in Von Soden, we see the one-sided character of their thought cropping out. Why not, with orthodoxy, be just toward all the teachings of the Scripture, those concerning the sinlessness, pre-existence, miracles, and divine titles of Christ, as well as to his single-minded devotion to his work? Does this lead us into mystery? The mystery of truth is better than clearness of vision secured by the admission of only the reconcilable facts.

**PROFESSOR C. SIEGFRIED, OF JENA.**

PROFESSOR SIEGFRIED may be taken as an example of those theologians who accept the most modern ideas of the Old Testament, and who yet hold to its religious worth. He claims to be able to set down the order in which the various portions of the Old Testament were admitted into the canon, and seems to attribute to the task of choosing from the existing literature those works which should belong to the sacred book a supervision almost inspired. He says that the choice of books on the part of the Synagogue and the Church is worthy of the highest esteem, and that we are in the fortunate situation to be able to prove by historical means that their judgment was correct. He triumphantly asserts that nowhere

in the whole world can be found a literature which for so many centuries has exerted such a colossal influence upon the life and morals of the nations as the books of the Old and New Testaments. He asks where we find the foundation of all true religion if not in the writings of the prophets, and where religious feeling has found more profound and beautiful expression than in the Psalms. The historical right to distinguish these books above all others, therefore, he asserts cannot be denied. But he objects seriously to the attempt to read into the Old Testament the later dogmas of the Church. The only way in which we can get the best profit from the Bible is to interpret it according to its natural historic sense, and then freely deduce the doctrines which this supports. Unless he trifles with words, Professor Siegfried is a believer in the Bible as the source of authority in religion. For he speaks of it as the "eternal word of the living God," and declares that we find in these books the foundation of our own religion. His whole train of argument requires the supposition of some sort of inspiration in the production of the books of the Bible, as well as an infallible guidance in their selection. It is interesting as showing how, when the critics think through the subject, they are obliged to assume a supernatural influence in their production or else yield the trustworthiness of the religion based upon them. Professor Siegfried, it will be noticed, decides for the religious value of the books, and hence for their inspiration, upon the ground of their moral influence, and not on account of any thing contained in the books themselves. This is practical rejection of internal evidence. This method may satisfy us; but what was the evidence to the Synagogue and the Church, who had not had such a series of centuries in which to observe the effect of Bible teachings? They must have taken these books upon the authority of their authors, or else upon the internal evidence of their divine origin.

---

PROFESSOR GUSTAV ADOLF FRICKE, OF LEIPSIK.

It is refreshing to find a man of such attainments as those of Professor Fricke still preserving his mental balance. Without harshness toward his opponents he maintains intact the orthodox faith. His department has brought him into contact with the great historic development of Christian doctrine. All capable judges who have heard his lectures or read his works must admit that in point of natural ability and educational outfit he is second to none. He is not "original." That is, he is not an expert in the art of putting into the words of authors meanings of which they never dreamed. But as a calm and fair-minded critic and an able expositor he stands pre-eminent. In a recent study of Rom. iii, 21-26, he defends the orthodox evangelical interpretation with great ability. The righteousness of God is a *justitia forensis* in opposition to every form of *justitia propria*, or *infusa*, or *inhaerens*. It excludes all desert of mankind. This righteousness is appropriated by faith, which is the subjective principle and ethical factor in the "righteousness of God." This relation to God is absolutely universal. All need redemption, and all are

capable of it. Rightly understood, the Scripture knows nothing of an absolute predestination. The propitiation and redemption by the sufferings, death, and resurrection of our Lord are demanded alike by the justice of God and by the human conscience. By Christ the chasm between man and God is bridged; the "other side" has become the possession of "this side" for time and eternity—we have through him eternal life even here. It is not difficult to see the superiority of such a faith to one which is forever philosophizing upon questions of decrees, or, worse, upon the nature and work of Christ. Here we feel that we have something tangible. Fricke is not one of those who are ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. And yet he is up with the times on all questions of criticism and speculation. He has weighed and measured all considerations upon every minutest phase of theology. But he does not believe that one may spend his whole time collecting evidence. To him evidence is for the sake of the verdict. It is pleasing, too, to find him denying fatalism. Methodism has never seen it in the Bible, and the learned world has had to sit at our feet and learn in this as in much besides. An ounce of experience is worth a pound of theory.

#### RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

##### THE ORGANISM OF THE UNIVERSAL REASON, AND THE LIFE OF HUMANITY IN THE SAME.\*

As an illustration of the lines in which thought is flowing in Europe the above work is worthy of notice. The author's purpose is to find in an absolute logic a doctrine which shall coincide in all principal points with Christian traditions, so that Christianity may be free from all elements contrary to nature and reason. As the mutual action of the atoms form the material world, so the universal reason is constituted out of intellectual essences. Science is threefold: 1. Positive, or the science of the external object; 2. Philosophical, or the science of the necessary idea; 3. Religious, or the science of the relation between God and man. The fact of redemption can be demonstrated by reason. If we did not believe in Jesus Christ as the Redeemer we should still be obliged to expect a redeemer to appear. The ideal aim of all human endeavor consists in the realization of the dominion of the spiritual man in the earth. The book is one of the many now appearing which attempt to recommend Christianity to men by showing its harmony with reason. So far as there is any value in them they are copied after Butler's *Analogy*. But as a rule all such books are friends from which Christianity may well pray to be delivered. Almost without exception they destroy the nerve of the doctrine they would uphold, leaving us only the outer form. Vital Christianity in daily life is its own best evidence, appealing not to the intellects, but to the consciences of mankind. All attempts to construct Christianity into a philosophy fall short of success. There may be a philosophy about

\* By Theodor von Barnbueler.

Christianity, but it is not Christianity any more than a science of music is music. The attempt to subject religion to a minute analysis has the effect of deadening its influence. It ignores the province of the emotions and the will. Christianity is a practical concern of humanity. It meets the wants of our daily life and promises to be to us all we shall need hereafter. Occasionally one may be intellectually convinced who will afterward yield his heart to Christ. But the majority, losing sight of the practical value of Christianity by these discussions, are lost in the mazes of speculation. It will remain ever true that with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.

#### THE ATTITUDE OF RECENT SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY TOWARD RELIGION.

AFTER all the attempts of infidels to show that religion is a worn-out superstition, the thinkers of the world have reached the opposite conclusion, namely, that religion is a necessity of man, and can never be banished nor destroyed. Every philosopher of influence to-day feels called upon to show how his system still leaves room for religion. Science can be more independent, because when limiting itself to its own sphere it has no other task than to discover and correlate facts. But just as soon as it leaves a particular department, and proposes to become universal, it finds itself face to face with phenomena in man which are inexplicable by the laws of the material universe. So much, then, may be considered as certain, that religion has held its ground in the struggle for existence. When it comes to the Christian religion, however, and especially as held by the orthodox Churches and taught in the Bible, the attitude of science and philosophy is less favorable. Not that there is much direct opposition, but that there is on the one side an attempt to construe the facts of revelation so as to make them harmonize with human thought in its modern form, and that on the other side the particular claims of Christianity are not considered. To science and philosophy it is sufficient to have admitted the claims of religion in general. Looked at from one stand-point there is in this very fact a silent concession that whatever is essential in Christianity is, as its advocates claim, revealed and supernatural. Philosophy and science thus admit that by searching they cannot find out the God of the Bible. In fact, philosophy as such cannot adopt the teachings of Christianity. The instant it does so it ceases to be philosophy and becomes Christian theology, or, at least, a mixture of philosophy and theology. The philosopher may indeed be also a Christian. He may be able to harmonize his Christian faith with his philosophical principles. Or, confessing his inability to do this, he may still give to Christianity on other than philosophical grounds such weight as to be unwilling to reject it. Wise men do not deny one well-established fact because they cannot harmonize it with another. But from philosophy and science alone we cannot expect more than that they do not assail the Christian system. It would be better for all concerned if Christianity were allowed to stand upon its own foundation. An illustration of the unsatisfactory nature of

all attempts at reconciliation of religion and science is found in Dr. Robert Koch's new book on *Nature and Man in the Light of the Doctrine of Evolution*. Dr. Koch shows that the difference between man and the animals is not one of gradation, but is essential. Man's superiority is in his power of speech, in self-consciousness, freedom of the will, and, above all, in the impulse to investigate and reflect upon supersensuous experiences. But since there are inexplicable problems left unsolved after all the progress of scientific investigation the human reason is compelled to postulate the existence of a divinity. Faith in God is not inborn in man, but arises from the impulse in man to seek for an explanation of phenomena. The different forms of religion and religious faith are the product of the poetic fancy in nations and individuals. Thus natural science and philosophy lead at last to God, and hence need not conflict with theology. To bring them into harmony the author regards as the task of our age. Acute as the reasoning is which leads to these conclusions, and favorable as they seem to religion, there are flaws to be seen, some doctrinal, others practical. Belief in the existence of a god is represented as the result of a logical process, and the doctrines and ceremonies of particular religions as the product of the imagination. This does not destroy the reality of God's existence, but it does weaken faith in it. There are those whose philosophy does not demand a god for the explanation of the phenomena of the universe. The argument leaves no room for the religious faculty in man, nor for a revelation from God to man. The practical defect in the work of Dr. Koch has thus been hinted at. Apologetics must be broad enough to meet the demands of all men. But if belief in God is the result of an investigation so extensive and profound that none but the most scholarly and thoughtful men can follow it, that belief must rest, if it exist at all, for the majority of mankind upon authority or tradition. There is an assumption, too, that fundamentally all religions have the same source, and that the difference in their values is to be accounted for by the superiority or inferiority of the minds and hearts dealing with the problems involved. Thus religion does not make men good, but is made good or bad by men. Christianity gains nothing from the aid of such thinkers and such thought.

---

#### A STRUGGLE FOR ETERNAL LIFE.

In this book by Reinhold Seeberg we have a picture of the life of a Mystic of the Middle Ages, Heinrich Suso. Beautifully written, it carries us back to the times in which Suso lived, and puts us into living sympathy with the ideas which then ruled the religious world. In Germany especially, since Ritschl wrote his *History of Pietism*, the place of mysticism in religion has been hotly contested. Hence such works as the one under consideration are peculiarly valuable to all who would study the effect of the mystical element in the religious life. In order that we may know the powers of any principle we must see it in actual operation. Seeberg admits that the Mystics were right in assuming that we can live a life of



blessedness here upon earth. But he finds the great fault of the Mystics in the fact that they sought it, not in the forgiveness of sins, but in a consciousness of physical nearness to God and spiritual union with him. But while this may be the truth as judged from Luther's saying, that "where forgiveness of sins is there is life and blessedness," yet it does not cover the whole ground. Personal religion is more than a mere ignoring of the antagonisms between ideals and realization, even though we do ignore them because we know our sins forgiven. There is in every truly Christian heart a desire to overcome the hinderances within and without which stand in the way of our moral progress and of our communion with God. The intense zeal of the mystical ascetics may have been misdirected, but they recognized and emphasized the need of a greater moral and spiritual nearness to God. Christianity means more than being saved from the consequences of our sins. It proposes the highest development of the spiritual nature of man. An excessive emphasis upon the doctrine of justification overlooks this. Seeberg, however, in common with all thinkers of his class, in opposing mysticism emphasizes the fact that Christianity demands faithfulness in our daily occupations, and that the Christian life is compatible with the performance of any legitimate duty. Mysticism by its virtual assertion of such incompatibility has done immense harm, and deserves the blows which are being dealt out to it in this practical age.

---

#### WEIZSÄCKER'S TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE book is in German, but many of the readers of the *Review* know enough of that language to avail themselves of this excellent work. Weizsäcker is tolerably liberal in his theology, but he believes that the New Testament is a book which all ought to read, and that a translation is the best form in which to convey to the masses the results of the latest and most scholarly investigations. "Translation is exegesis." The translator gives his conception of the meaning of a passage in the Greek Testament by means of translation. And if this method denies him the opportunity of defending his exegesis before scholars it has the advantage of direct appeal to the reader without the confusing effects of arguments *pro* and *con*. In fact, the results of critical investigation can in this simple way be made the property of all readers. The translation is from the most critically revised text, and if well made is an exact reproduction of its spirit. Passages which were formerly regarded as genuine, but which have been proved by investigation to be interpolations, can be quietly dropped out, and all the bewilderment occasioned by critical comments can thus be avoided. The transit from the *textus receptus* to the most advanced results can thus be made without confusion, and the next generation of Christians would be the product of such a Bible. But were this method employed it would throw an immense burden of responsibility upon translators. Weizsäcker does not introduce the results of the so-called higher criticism into his translation. He takes the New Testament books as he finds them, studies the text with the utmost care, and then translates

with a view to reproducing the contents of the Greek in German. Consequently all the books of our New Testament appear under the names of the authors to whom they are generally ascribed. Even Hebrews is attributed to Paul. Our Revised Version is an attempt in the same direction. Weizsaecker recognizes the fact that in modernizing his language he loses some of the force of Luther's translation. But he rightly feels that it is better to give an exact reproduction of the mind of the Spirit than to preserve terseness of style. May the time soon come when the opposers of our Revised Version will cease to prefer the strong Anglo-Saxon of our Authorized Version to the real meaning of the holy book!

---

#### RELIGIOUS.

##### ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS.

In order that the readers of the *Review* may form some idea of the activity of the Roman Catholic world we give an outline of the work of the recent international congress in Mechlin, Belgium. Attention was paid to the erection of houses for neglected children; to the formation of associations for the perfection of the school system; the development of Roman Catholic universities, and the founding of literary and art societies in all Roman Catholic organizations. The department of social work recommended societies for professional people; the establishment of houses for laborers; the foundation of labor societies and of co-operative associations. The department of science and art studied the question of the establishment of Christian theaters, and recommended the reading of Christian books. In the general session of the 9th of September M. d'Hulst spoke in favor of the founding of Roman Catholic universities. On the 10th Bishop Stillemaus appealed to the assembly in favor of supporting the action of Belgium on the Congo. This partial outline of subjects considered and measures projected is suggestive. The Roman Catholics are alive to the needs of the hour, and in their way are trying to meet them, of course in the interest of the Roman Church. About eighteen hundred persons were present as participants in the congress from various countries of Europe, chiefly, however, from Belgium.

---

##### SECULARIZATION OF BOYS' SCHOOLS IN FRANCE.

On the 1st of October, 1891, a weighty and radical change was made in the conduct of boys' schools throughout France. In 1886 a law was passed providing that at the end of five years the clerical teachers should be replaced by secular. During the year 1891 the number of clerical teachers of all classes was reduced to 1,213 out of a total of 52,000. This change has not been as yet so completely executed in girls' schools, the law of 1886 not having fixed any definite date for the expulsion of the female religious teachers. The reason of this is that a sufficient number of competent secular female teachers cannot yet be found. Of 44,000 female

teachers 11,000 are still drawn from the religious houses. But this change is also only a question of time. Perhaps from the stand-point of the struggle between Protestantism and Romanism the redisplacement of the religious teachers may be a gain. But it means the expulsion of religious instruction of any kind from the schools of France, and to a considerable extent prevents instruction even by persons whose sympathies are Christian. In other words, it is a clear gain for infidelity, since infidelity and infidel teachers are not excluded.

---

#### EVANGELICAL RELIGION IN BERNE.

THE Canton of Berne, Switzerland, is in the main of the reformed faith, accepting a mild interpretation of the Helvetic Confession. But the most diverse theological tendencies are represented among the clergy. The one hundred and sixty pastors are divided as follows: eighty adhere to the middle party, forty to the radical reformers, about half of the remaining forty are known as orthodox, while the last twenty belong to the Pietists. The extreme orthodox preachers complain loudly of the religious condition, and will not be comforted because so many prefer a living Christianity to a dead orthodoxy. And as every-where, so in Berne, there is much reason for complaint of the status of religion. But one thing can be said of the inhabitants of Berne—they are not lukewarm. They are either hot or cold. As compared with German cities of the same size Berne is far in the van. Thousands find their way to the churches of the orthodox pastors and to the chapels of the Methodists and other dissenting bodies, as well as to the week-night meetings. Sunday is well observed both in the city and in the country. On the highest Alps and in the deepest valleys the people assemble for worship. In regard to temperance, also, Switzerland leads continental Europe, and Berne is among the foremost of the cantons in this reform.

---

#### THE SOCIETY OF THE BLUE CROSS.

THIS most vigorous temperance society of continental Europe recently held its anniversary in Geneva, the city of its birth. The object of the society is to assist the victims of the drink habit to reform. The pledge requires total abstinence, but the society does not condemn those who make a moderate use of stimulants. These provisions illustrate the undeveloped condition of temperance work in Europe. A few years' experience will show the workers in this cause that if there were no moderate drinkers the special work of the Blue Cross Society would soon be superfluous. Already the society is beginning to call in the aid of the State, and the method is peculiar. The tenth of the tax on brandy is to be devoted to the relief of the evil the traffic produces. This is supported by the consistory. The report of the management shows that France is the most difficult field of labor which the society has yet entered.

## EDITORIAL REVIEWS.

## SPIRIT OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

THE numerous papers which appear in the religious Reviews of the day show that the persistent recklessness with which destructive criticism has assailed the claims of the Bible to divine inspiration has given this great question a foremost place in the thought of the Christian Church. Nor are those papers simply defensive of these claims. Rather, their attitude is that of attack on the theories by which that skeptical criticism seeks to destroy human confidence in the revealed word. Seeing that this criticism is like shifting sands, drifting hither and thither, denying to-day what it affirmed yesterday, Christian scholarship is becoming confident of its speedy overthrow, and is assailing it with a skill and force which may be safely accepted as an augury that at no distant day the injury heretofore done to popular faith in God's holy book will be repaired, and the mass of men will unquestioningly accept it as the truth by which alone they can be saved.

As illustrative of this aggressive spirit one may note *The Presbyterian Quarterly* (South) for October, which in one article, entitled, "The Universal Book," lucidly points out the vast range of Bible principles and their fitness to meet every exigency and interest of humanity. On its human side this writer justly affirms that it is "as distinctly human as if it were all human; on its divine side it is as distinctly divine as if it were all divine—the analogue of the real Word, the God-man." In another article "Verbal Inspiration" is defended, not as being mechanical, but that its writers were so completely "borne along by the Holy Spirit" as to preserve them from all error, and to guide them infallibly in speaking and writing the matters revealed to them in the identical words in which they were communicated, and in recording accurately what they had learned by their own ordinary experience. In a third paper certain alleged discrepancies between "Chronicles" and "Kings" are satisfactorily shown by exegesis and examination of the topography of Palestine to be no discrepancies at all, except in the eyes of critics in eager pursuit of them. Still again, in its Editorial, this scholarly *Review* insists, perhaps, with premature confidence, that it is time for Protestantism to regard the inspiration of the Bible as "a closed question," to be expounded and maintained but not to be controverted as doubtful! *The Theological Monthly* also has a very strong paper on Inspiration, which, in contending for plenary verbal inspiration, discriminates between verbal inspiration and verbal dictation, and also between inspiration and revelation; that is, between "the material or matter of the Sacred Record and the recording of it." It ably meets several objections to its theory of verbal inspiration. And *The Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South,*

has a correspondent whose clear, sharp pen dissects the "documentary hypothesis" of the rationalists concerning the book of Genesis, and concludes his argument by claiming, on good grounds, that the said hypothesis is but "an assumption which for lack of substantial evidence might be banished to the realm of myth and fancies." Its editor also briefly comments on that theory of inspiration which practically ignores the human element; on that which gives undue emphasis to the human and too little to the divine; and on the dynamical theory. He, too, prefers the doctrine of plenary inspiration, which concedes that the Holy Ghost, as "the productive principle, embraced the entire activity" of the inspired man, "rendering his language the word of God." He boldly and rightly concludes that "the plenary inspiration of the Bible is a truth far removed from the possibility of refutation." Obviously these writers do not anticipate the triumph of skeptical criticism.

THE *Quarterly Review of the United Brethren in Christ* for October discusses: 1. "Transcendentalism;" 2. "The Number Seven;" 3. "The Church's Tribute to Vice;" 4. "Silence in Heaven;" 5. "Ecclesiasticism." The first of these papers traces the history of transcendentalism from Aristotle to Kant, Schelling, Coleridge, and Emerson; exposes the false principles which it has embodied; and contends for a transcendental philosophy which shall not transcend experience, but which shall recognize and demonstrate the *a priori* elements, "the preconditions of knowledge" included in "the whole of consciousness or in experience." It is a discriminative and sound article. The second paper finds in the number *seven*, which recurs more than six hundred times in Holy Writ, a symbol of the divine Being which reveals the *mode* of that Being. It is an interesting paper, but, as we view it, its theory is more fanciful than solid. The third paper has some good points respecting the neglect of the Churches to enforce the duty of its members to apply Christian principles to their political action by refusing to vote for men of questionable character; but when it teaches that a business man is morally responsible for the vices of his employees we must demur. That he should try to reform them is clearly his duty, and there may be cases of odious conduct which would obligate him to refuse employment to the guilty. The article strains its theory too much. The fifth article is a well-grounded plea for such union between churches based on the essentials of their respective creeds as would prevent the multiplication of churches for merely denominational ends.

THE *London Quarterly Review* for October has: 1. "Browning's Life and Teaching;" 2. "Abraham Lincoln;" 3. "A New Study of the Commonwealth;" 4. "Lawrence Oliphant;" 5. "St. Dominic;" 6. "A Picture of London Poverty;" 7. "Wesley His Own Biographer;" 8. "Industrial Provision for Old Age;" 9. "Archbishop Tait." The first of these vigorously written papers judiciously criticises Mrs. Orr's *Life of Browning*;

summarizes the leading events in the poet's life; briefly describes his poetical career; notes his successive productions; estimates his influence as a thinker and teacher; discusses his religious principles, and concludes that, though he was not a Christian in the orthodox sense of that word, he nevertheless "vindicated certain essential principles of Christianity." The second paper tersely reviews the *History of Abraham Lincoln* by Nicolay and Hay, which it finds lacking the skill of a literary artist, overloaded with detail, yet invaluable as a work of reference. The reviewer recognizes the real greatness of Lincoln, and claims that he was "a far more representative American than Washington." The third paper reviews a recent biography of Cromwell by Frederic Harrison, in which the acts of the great protector are shown to be evidence that in the material and social interests of England he did his duty as a ruler to the best of his ability. The reviewer accepts this evidence as valid. Evidently Oliver's reputation in England is in a fair way of being cleansed from the mud cast upon it by his royalist foes. The seventh paper reviews with warm approval a recent work bearing the title *Wesley His Own Biographer*, in which extracts from Wesley's charming Journals are made to tell the story of his life. This book, says our reviewer, "has already established its popularity." In the ninth paper the *Life of Archbishop Tait* is admirably reviewed. Its writer gives the pith of that work, and is in full sympathy with its author's very high estimate of the archbishop, whom he designates "the wisest and most powerful primate of all England that modern England has known."

THE *Lutheran Quarterly* for October has: 1. "The Sacred Scriptures;" 2. "The Bible the World-Book;" 3. "The General Question;" 4. "Catechisation and Confirmation in the Lutheran Church;" 5. "The Joys of the Ministry;" 6. "The Divine Formula for the Administration of the Lord's Supper;" 7. "Status and Treatment of the Non-Communing Adult Member;" 8. "The Christian College;" 9. "The Evangelical Element in Catechisation;" 10. "Our Debts—Our Trespasses." The first of these papers is a scholarly exposition and defense of the inspiration of Holy Scripture. Admitting that while "the form or mold in which its thoughts are given was human and historical, it argues that "its *thought* can be explained only on the basis of a supernatural and divine origin." Of the advanced or destructive criticism of the times it justly claims that its "critical canons and methods would annihilate the historical credibility of even the best authenticated literary document in the world." This type of criticism finds no support in the attitude of the Lutheran Church, which holds that "the word of *God*, not of *man*, is for her *existence*, the beginning, middle, and end." The second paper finds "a strong identical proof of the divinity of the holy oracles" in the fact that "certain beneficial influences" have every-where followed their possession "with a uniformity as unbroken as the connection between physical cause and effect." For this alleged fact it presents a series of historical proofs. In

the fifth paper, after noting the trials, perplexities, and discouragements peculiar to the ministry, its writer presents a series of points tending to show that "the office affords the largest opportunities to be what is best, to suffer what is most desirable in human discipline," and to gain "the most satisfactory rewards." The tenth paper offers good exegetical evidence that the proper term in the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer is not *debts*, but *trespasses*—"forgive us our *trespasses*."

THE *Andover Review* for October has: 1. "An Advance Step in Sunday-school Bible Study;" 2. "The Cherokee Outlet;" 3. "Criticism *versus* Ecclesiasticism;" 4. "Is Christ Himself the Sufficient Creed of Christianity;" 5. "The Authority of the Pulpit in a Time of Critical Research and Social Confusion." Of these papers the first may furnish suggestions to the committee which prepares the *International Sunday-school Lessons*; the second calls the attention of the country to the unjust measures for opening up certain Cherokee lands to white settlement soon to be considered by the lower house of Congress. Its points seem to be well taken. The third paper discusses the principle, development, futility, and probable decay of the Oxford movement. The fifth article is Professor Tucker's opening address at Andover Theological Seminary, September 16, 1891. It is an admirable piece of literary work. It contains a defense of biblical criticism to which one could not reasonably object if its author had only qualified it by disavowing all sympathy with that destructive criticism which tends to weaken, if not to destroy, the faith of men in the Bible as *God's* book. After conceding that such criticism is "creating its own uncertainties in respect to the sources and methods of revealed truth," and seriously disturbing "the aim of the pulpit," it would seem that simple justice to the students of the seminary and to the Church which sustains it required such a disavowal from their eloquent Professor. In its November number this *Review* outlines and annotates Dr. Patton's "Recovered Address on Future Probation," and prints in full the report of the Committee of Prosecution against Dr. Briggs.

THE *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for October treats of: 1. "Eternal Retribution;" 2. "Simon Peter in the School of Christ;" 3. "Hypothesis and Dogma in the Sciences;" 4. "The New Psychology;" 5. "The Prophecies of Balaam;" 6. "The Vocabulary of the New Testament;" 7. "International Missionary Union;" 8. "General Synod of the Reformed Church in America;" 9. "General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada." Of these papers we note the first, which is a critical elucidation of the Scripture doctrine of endless punishment, many of its points being directed against the sophisms found in a work on the "Restitution of All Things," by Mr. Jukes; the second paper most ably and attractively analyzes the character of St. Peter, especially noting its development under the teaching of Jesus. The third paper, which is eminently lucid and logical, aims to harmonize science and religion by accepting the



sound principle that "we must start with pure science as freed from mere hypothesis, and pure Scripture as freed from mere dogma." The fourth paper discusses the various theories of writers who seek light upon the nature and operations of the mind through the study of the brain. It gives good reasons for concluding that "there is very little that is both new and true in it, except the physics and the physiology." It is therefore a misnomer to call it a new psychology. The fifth paper discusses with scholarly acumen the composition, date, literary character, significance, and application of Balaam's prophecies. It is, if not conclusive, yet comprehensive, and goes far toward rescuing this episode of the Pentateuch from the objections of the destructive critics. The sixth article is a valuable contribution to the study of the "Words" of the New Testament. Students of Scripture philology will prize it highly.

---

THE *American Catholic Quarterly Review* for October treats of: 1. "Aquinas Resuscitatus;" 2. "Development of English Catholic Literature;" 3. "Religion of the Ancient Egyptians;" 4. "The Two Sicilies and the Camorra;" 5. "The Roman Catacombs;" 6. "Religion in Education;" 7. "The Suppression of the Templars;" 8. "Why Education Should be Free;" 9. "Edgar Allan Poe;" 10. "The Paganism of Caesar;" 11. "The Battle of the Boyne and the Siege of Limerick." This *Review*, which is edited with much literary ability, is fully up to its standard in this number. We note its second and eleventh papers as illustrating the manifest purpose of the papal Church to rewrite the history of modern civilization for the purpose of whitewashing its own unholy part in it by insisting that Protestant history has been "a conspiracy against the truth." But the spots will not out at its bidding. Its sixth, eighth, and tenth papers treat our public school systems from different points of view, and contend with Jesuitical subtlety for the supremacy of the Catholic Church over the State in the matter of education, and for the right of papists to have their parochial schools supported by the State. Romanism has many keen intellects in its ranks, and will not die until it is smitten by Christ with "the sword of his mouth."

---

THE *Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, for October has: 1. "A Backwoods Methodist Preacher;" 2. "Life in the Shadow of Sin and Want;" 3. "Patrick Henry;" 4. "The Negro and Domestic Service in the South;" 5. "Government of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South;" 6. "The Two Sons of Oil;" 7. "Murphy's Genesis and the Documentary Hypothesis;" 8. "The Lost Tribes of Israel;" 9. "The Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence;" 10. "Foreign Influence in China;" 11. "Jesus, and the Jews and Pilate." Of these papers we note the first as a spirited sketch of the life and labors of the venerable Dr. Chauncey Hobart; the third is a eulogy of Patrick Henry, whose advocacy of State rights in the convention which framed the United States Constitution contained the germ which found its full development in the War of

the Rebellion; the fourth shows that the Negro in the South is as inefficient in domestic service as the majority of white servants are in the North; the eighth reviews favorably two recent works, one by Professor C. L. McArtha, the other by Professor C. A. L. Totten, both of which seek to prove "the identity of the lost tribes with the Anglo-Saxon race!" As a whole this is an excellent number of a *Review* which is always scholarly, vigorous, and suggestive.

THE *Christian Thought* for October discusses: 1. "The Scientific and Social Law of Survival;" 2. "The Children of Adam;" 3. "The Origin and Power of Religious Ideas;" 4. "Current Thought." The first of these papers is characterized by originality and vigorously expressed thought. It dissects and refutes Darwin's theory of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest. In the name of science it claims that "the spiritual law of life is love, that the material law is correspondence with the means of subsistence, and that the social law is co-operation." The second paper teaches a vague theory concerning the Mosaic account of the creation and fall of man. It assumes, with Clement and Anselm, that it is not history, but allegory. Obviously its amiable writer has an exuberant fancy. The third article is a deeply thoughtful argument which finds the source of religious ideas in the fact of universal God-consciousness, "in the immediate knowledge man has of God."

THE *Nineteenth Century* for October treats of: 1. "Federating the Empire: a Colonial Plan;" 2. "Question of Disestablishment;" 3. "The Private Life of Sir Thomas More;" 4. "Welsh Fairies;" 5. "The Wisdom of Gombo;" 6. "Immigration Troubles of the United States;" 7. "The Wild Women as Social Insurgents;" 8. "Naval Policy of France;" 9. "The Military Forces of the Crown;" 10. "Stray Thoughts of an Indian Girl;" 11. "A Bardic Chronicle;" 12. "Ancient Beliefs in a Future State." Of these papers the first, second, sixth, eighth, and ninth have value for those who study the progress of public opinion upon political and international questions. The seventh paper keenly satirizes a class of women supposed to exist in England, whose "ideal is absolute personal independence, coupled with supreme power over men." If such women really exist they must be both wild and wicked. In the eleventh article Gladstone argues that belief in immortality was stronger in primitive times than in after ages until Christ brought it to light.

THE *Westminster Review* discusses: "The Ordeal of Trade Unionism," "History and Radicalism," "Free Education in the United States," "Charles Bradlaugh," "Ernest Renan," "Gothic Architecture," and "The New Empire."—The *Edinburgh Review* for October has: 1. "Sir Robert Peel;" 2. "A Moorland Parish;" 3. "The Water-color Painters of England;" 4. "Writings of James Russell Lowell;" 5. "Major Clarke on Fortifications;" 6. "Austria in 1848-9;" 7. "Life of Arch-

bishop Tait;" 8. "The Affairs of China;" 9. "Germany and Moltke;" 10. "The Twelfth Parliament of the Queen." Of these excellent papers we note the fourth, seventh, eighth, and ninth as having special popular interest.

THE *Church Review* for October is a very attractive number. Its paper on "Deaconesses and Their Training" is valuable because descriptive of the methods of the Episcopal Churches in England and America in dealing with the deaconess question. An article on "Intellectual Modesty" finds this virtue sadly lacking in rationalistic critics. Another paper on "The Family in Roman Civil Law" is historically valuable. Were this *Review* less ultra in its views of the "Historic Episcopate" its influence, outside of High Church circles, might promote that Christian unity of which it speaks often, but which it makes impossible by unchurching all bodies which do not accept that unproven theory.

THE *Presbyterian Quarterly* (South) for October is filled with papers of high merit, some of them being enthusiastic in defense of undiluted Calvinism. Its papers on the inspiration of Holy Scripture, noticed on another page, are strong and valuable.—*Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*. Volume I, No. 1, of these "studies" contains a monograph on "The Divorce Problem," by W. F. Willcox, Ph.D. It is based upon the "Report on Marriage and Divorce" transmitted to Congress by the "Commissioner on Labor," and is so analyzed as to show "the influence of legislation on divorce." To students of the divorce problem it is a very valuable document.—The *North American Review* for November treats of "Russian Barbarities," "Free Silver," "Our Business Prospects," "How to Improve Municipal Government," "Italy and the Pope," etc. These are live questions, and are ably treated by distinguished writers.—The *Contemporary Review* for October has among its best papers an appreciative sketch of James Russell Lowell, with brief critical notices of his works; an examination of the results of the eight-hour day in various industries, which claims that the old rate of daily production, of wages, and of profits will be maintained; a statement of the reasons now urged in English university circles for and against the retention of Greek as a compulsory study; a paper giving the estimation in which our railway securities are held by English capitalists, with other articles of general interest.—*Harper's Monthly* for November has among its illustrated papers, "Cairo in 1890," Part Second; "Stonewall Jackson," and "The London of Good Queen Bess." Several good stories and an assortment of papers from the editor's "Easy Chair," "Study," and "Drawer," suited to readers of varied tastes, also contribute to keep it up to its high standard of excellence.—The *Chautauquan* for November presents its usual variety of topics treated by able contributors and by its always suggestive editor.—The *Theological Monthly* for October has: 1. "The Question of Inspiration;" 2. "Eece

Christianus," Part Four; 3. "Philosophy and Religion;" 4. "Inspired Hebrew Poetry;" 5. "Jonathan." Of these papers we note the first and the third as being sound, thoughtful, and suggestive.—The *Fortnightly Review* for October has among its most noteworthy papers one on "The Emancipation of Women," by Frederic Harrison, who discusses the organic difference implanted by nature between man and woman in body, in mind, in feeling, and in energy, claiming that because of this difference woman should be relieved by men from the harder tasks of industry and from the management of the State, and left free to make home a heaven on earth. In another paper it draws a picture of the demoralized condition of Russian society that is painfully startling. We note also a strong paper urging the appointment of women to places on the Royal Commission on Labor as necessary to bring into the light the oppressions of women in several industries of England.—*Our Day* for October discusses the propriety of an effort on the part of the United States to secure the opening of Palestine to the Jews for settlement; it advocates the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, opposes the Sunday opening of art museums, and, in Dr. Cook's Monday Lecture, shows the bearing of certain scientific concessions on the doctrine of Christ's resurrection.—The *Missionary Review* for November is filled with important missionary intelligence from all parts of the world.—The *Gospel in All Lands* for November is mainly filled with interesting papers touching the countries and people of South America.—*Lippincott's Monthly Magazine* for December has: 1. "A Fair Blockade Runner;" 2. "Negro Superstition;" 3. "Literature in the South Since the War;" 4. "An Antique;" 5. "A Moccasin among the Hobbys;" 6. "At a Florist's;" 7. "The Majesty of Law." This is styled by its publisher a "Southern number," because it deals with Southern topics. The writer of "Southern Literature Since the War," after noting the works of recent Southern writers, expresses the opinion that thus far Southern literature has not been fully up to the standard of former days, lacking originality and high literary excellence.

## BOOKS: CRITIQUES AND NOTICES.

## BOOKS AS LAMPS.

SOME books quench the light that is in us; then the darkness is great. Other books illuminate our thinking by pointing out the difficulties in our logic, strengthening or destroying our theories and our philosophies, and in their last effect helping us to be original and independent. Such books are revelations—lamps to guide us in our searchings. On Saturday, October 24, 1891, Bishop John F. Hurst commenced rewriting his *History of Rationalism*. Two years will be devoted to the task; students can afford to wait for its completion. Bishop R. S. Foster is producing a series of works on theology, three of which have been published. He that would be rich in thought will hasten to possess them. Dr. John Miley, of Drew Theological Seminary, is hard at work on two volumes of theology—masterly treatises on divine themes. Of the books noticed in this number the following are lamp-like in their influence: *Pronaos to Holy Writ*, by Isaac M. Wise; *Indika*, by Bishop J. F. Hurst; *What is Reality?* by F. H. Johnson; *Manual of the Science of Religion*, by P. D. Chantepie De La Saussaye; and *The Franco-German War of 1870-71*, by Field-Marshal Count Helmuth Von Moltke.

## RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

*Pronaos to Holy Writ*. Establishing on Documentary Evidence the Authorship, Date, Form, and Contents of Each of its Books and the Authenticity of the Pentateuch. By ISAAC M. WISE, President of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati. 8vo, pp. 193. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. Price; cloth, \$1.50.

In the studies respecting the higher criticism we have usually consulted the Christian view, or interpreted the literary and historical problems involved according to the long-standing beliefs of the Christian Church. Nor could it be otherwise, since Christianity would be ultimately affected by the issues of the investigation going on. However, it is with pleasure that we call attention to a work written by a learned Hebrew, and wholly from the Jewish creed-point of the Old Testament, which on the whole confirms the general positions of orthodoxy respecting the main points in the pending controversy. Rabbi Wise does not write in the interest of the Christian faith, nor with regard to any of its tenets; but he is concerned for the literary character of the Old Testament books and their authorship, as handed down from the earliest ages. Writing thus independently, his investigations and conclusions, though in some instances contrary to our teaching, are entitled to more than ordinary consideration, and, in the absence of countervailing evidence, to be at least temporarily accepted. His aversion to Christianity, implied rather than expressed, interferes with a correct interpretation of the prophecies, and may disqualify him for discerning the spiritual import of the Judaic economy;

but we are not certain that it interferes with the exercise of a just judgment respecting the value and integrity of the biblical literature. We are of opinion, also, that he relies too much upon the work of the Great Synod, which may or may not have existed, and that to him the Talmud is of too high authority in these matters, though he is bound to esteem the literature of his people and the consensus of the ancient writers. In some other respects he departs from the Christian view, but it is a striking fact that, with few exceptions, he reaches the conclusions heartily accepted by Christian thinkers, and supports the traditional authorship of the Old Testament against the opposing views of rationalists and infidels. If, then, the orthodox position may, on the whole, be vindicated both from the Christian and Jewish view-points, is it not almost conclusive that it is approximately correct?

With the higher critics Rabbi Wise has little sympathy, though occasionally he concedes some things, not as wrought out by them but as original in Jewish history, which they doubtless will eagerly appropriate. He denounces modern biblical criticism for its negativism, and, declaring its methods to be unscientific, he proposes to meet it with documentary evidence such as it cannot resist. He holds that the basis of Old Testament religion is the authenticity of the Mosaic records, or that the whole depends on the preservation of the Pentateuchal books from those theorists who would assign a late origin to any of them. To establish the Mosaic origin of these books he proceeds in an inverse order of study—that is, he deems it important first of all to establish the historical veracity of the post-pentateuchal records, inasmuch as these furnish a large part of the testimony upon which he relies for meeting negative criticism and buttressing the main proposition of the book. He is confident that by this process, whether or not he succeeds in proving to a certainty the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, he demolishes all the arguments of the rationalists against it. Taking up the historical books, he shows them to be historical, and by them deduces a pentateuchal argument that is irrefutable. To the later prophets he gives specific attention, discussing dates, contents, characteristics, and authorship, rebuking the theory that they were written *post festum*, and maintaining from them the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. As respects *Isaiah*, he holds (p. 71) that "there exists no necessity to suppose that any chapter or part of one, from i to xxxix, was not written by the very Isaiah, son of Amoz, whose name is at the head of the book." But as to *Isaiah* xl to lxvi he holds that it is the product of another prophet, or other prophets, that lived near the close of the Babylonian captivity or the dedication of the second temple; but the author or authors are unknown. He derives this opinion partly from the Talmud and partly from a difference of diction in the two parts; but he also holds that the fifty-third chapter is a funeral oration over a king of Judah! Even this slip or concession does not compromise the main argument. He next controverts the theoretic attacks on the hagiographic books, particularly pointing out the monotheism in the Psalms in contradiction of the rationalistic theory that they do not teach the doctrine or

theology of pure monotheism, proving that the book of Proverbs is the "genuine work of Solomon," and that Job, written in the last days of Nehemiah, is a revelation of the doctrines of providence and righteousness. As to *Daniel*, the Aramaic portion was written by the prophet, but the Hebrew portion by another, B. C. 170; but he finds in it, as a whole, corroborative evidence of the Mosaic character of the Pentateuch.

And now, with this abundant preliminary support, with documents that are of undisputed value in Israel, he addresses himself to the proposition that the Pentateuch dates from the time of Moses, and that he was its author. He refutes the common theory of Jehovistic and Elohistie authorships of sections or chapters, as well as the hypothesis of fragments, and turns the tables on those who have employed an argument *e silentio* against Moses by showing that it maintains his authorship against all gainsayers. Evidence, direct and indirect; arguments from contemporaneous history and the annals of Israel; arguments internal and external from the Pentateuch; arguments from Moses and Ezra; arguments from the Talmud and the Great Synod; arguments from Jewish writers and the Jewish faith, concur in supporting the Mosaic origin of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. In the presence of such arguments theories expire, captious criticism evaporates like frost under the sun, and the traditions of Israel remain unshaken and unimpaired. The documentary evidence for the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch is complete and irresistible. Rabbi Wise has earned the thanks of the Christian world for his scholarly settlement of a controversy that threatened Israel, as it threatened the Christian Church, with a flood-tide of skepticism and irrational unfaith. *Pronaos* negatives destructive criticism.

*Saint Matthew's Witness to Words and Works of the Lord; or, Our Saviour's Life as Revealed in the Gospel of His Earliest Evangelist.* By FRANCIS W. UPHAM, LL.D., Author of *The Star of Our Lord*; or, Christ Jesus King of All Worlds, both of Time or Space; *Thoughts on the Holy Gospels*, etc. 12mo, pp. 415. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price, cloth, \$1.20.

It is with great satisfaction that we refer to the masterly work of Dr. Upham on the import of Matthew's gospel. From his distinction in authorship we were prepared to expect a scholarly and painstaking study of the history of the gospel, with matured reflections on its varied contents, and such a clear unfolding of the meaning of its most occult teachings as would satisfy the skeptical and the critical as to what the evangelist teaches and enforces, but the book exceeds our expectations. It is not the product of a hasty hour, nor a book based on the opinions of others; but every page is a witness to hard labor, and the whole bears the unmistakable marks of original research and deduction. It is a book for these days, when rationalism assails the divine with as much boldness as the human, and when too many are inclined to accept wrong interpretations, more because they are new than because there is any evidence for them. In all such cases the influence of the book will be that of a prophylactic, preventing the spread of the disease. For Dr. Upham rightly holds that biblical criti-



cism "can never be a science in the sense in which geometry is a science," and, therefore, the biblical books cannot be rigidly estimated by its rules and axioms. He does not allow the critic to determine this gospel by the canons of criticism, but he brings to it, out of the treasure-house of his knowledge, as abundant scholarship as any who would destroy it. He maintains that Matthew wrote two gospels, the one in Hebrew, the other in Greek, the latter being in substance the former, and yet not a translation. To this view we see no objection, as it settles some otherwise troublesome questions. When, however, he maintains that Matthew's gospel was the first in order of preparation he is not completely convincing, though the general reader will be in sympathy with the conclusion. It occurs to us, also, to say that the book had gained in force had the twenty-fifth chapter, on "The Two Leading Ideas in the First Gospel," been introduced early into the book; for, according to the present arrangement, one must read about three hundred pages before one discovers the aim or trend of the gospel. With these minor exceptions, together with the suggestion that an overbold sentence now and then might be omitted, we may indorse this book as happily adapted to strengthen one's appreciation of Matthew as a biographer of our Lord, and one's faith in the fundamentals of Christianity. In thirty-four chapters the author develops the purpose of the biography, dwelling in particular upon the Sermon on the Mount, miracles, scenes in the life of Christ, and the events of his last days on the earth, and embodying the issues of his life in reflections of positive beauty and excellence. Philosophy joins history in elucidation of facts, while a devout religious spirit transfigures the narrative from beginning to end. The work shows complete mastery of details, with literary tact in combining them into a marvelous and symmetrical whole: for the author is irresistible in showing that the gospel, instead of being a collection of miscellanies, was written according to a preconceived plan, and is as distinct in its unity and as remarkable for its homogeneity of structure and design as any single history ever written. Thus, without attacking the captious critic, he disposes of his criticism by vindicating an alternate view. As the fruit of years of ripened study it deserves to take its place among the solid books that constitute the working library of the minister.

*A History of Christianity.* From the German of Professor RUDOLPH SOHM (Leipsic). By CHARLES W. RISHELL, M.A. With Revisions, Notes, and Additions. 12mo, pp. 370. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, \$1.

In outline this work covers four periods of church history, arranged in logical order, with all their varying developments and external antagonisms. Beginning with the origin of Christianity, which required a brief survey of the Roman world and conflicts with Judaism and heathenism, the co-authors trace the Church to its permanent establishment, with the rise of church councils, of monasticism, and of sacerdotalism in worship. Nearly one hundred pages are devoted to the history of the Church in the

Middle Ages, with its influence among the Franks and its unfoldings in Germany, with concordats, crusades, and knighthood, the growth of mendicant orders, the excesses of papal power, the degeneration of ecclesiasticism, the reign of scholasticism, and the decline in morals. Naturally the period of the Reformation follows, which includes the rise of the Protestants, the counter reformation of the Roman Catholic Church, the spread of pietism and rationalism, and the defined relation of State and Church. The development of Protestantism in the English-speaking world, with a brief notice of Methodism, furnishes the theme for the concluding chapter of the book. The Appendix contains supplementary and explanatory notes and various chronological tables relating to the popes of Rome and the ecumenical councils of the Roman Catholic Church. This fragment of its contents by no means indicates the real value of the book, though it serves to show the plan of the authors, and gives a concise view of the progress of church history. There is in its pages more than a catalogue of events that make up the career of the Church; but no history of that career is credible that does not harmonize with the events that contributed to it or were identical with it. But with the actual history given there are also those philosophical judgments of great events and great characters, and the exhibition of those crises or turning-points in development, without which the great movement of Christianity cannot be understood. It is one thing to narrate history; it is quite another to interpret it. It is not too much to say that this book fulfills a high mission in ecclesiastical literature, both as a narration and an interpretation, aiding the reader to connect causes and effects in the progress of Christian institutions and to discover the underlying plan and ultimate meaning of all history. Were it not for this view of church history the book would be wanting in an essential, for it is compelled to follow the familiar course of development without finding new facts or even a new order of their appearance. It is another merit of the book that, while the product of two pens, there is such a coalescing of mind and feeling as to make it difficult to decide to whose authorship any part may be assigned. We would not make the impression that, while the work is superior in its preparation, it is either complete as a history or always correct in its inferences; but it is quite proper to say that as a compact presentation of the chief periods of church history it will be useful even when larger volumes may be easy of access. With this general statement we do not think it necessary to emphasize particular sections or any special discussion in the book, but recommend it to those who prefer a small volume with much in it to a large volume whose chief excellence is its size.

*The Gospel of St. John.* By MARCUS DODS, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. In two volumes. Vol. I, 8vo, pp. 388. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

Dr. Dods has not written a critical work such as will accommodate linguists or students of biblical criticism. He does not discuss the question of the authorship of the fourth gospel, but always and rightly

assumes that John wrote it; nor does he elaborate any theory of Christ's resurrection, but presents it as a stupendous fact and the unanswerable proof that Jesus is the Son of God. The value of the book, besides its orderly arrangement and clear presentation of the contents of the gospel, is its unfolding of the evident plan of John in its preparation, for the suggestion of which Dr. Dods is indebted to De Wette. John aims to detail the manifestations of Christ's glory among men with its culmination in the scene of the resurrection. Accordingly his gospel, beginning with the incarnation, is divided into two parts, the first relating to the works of Christ, the second to his sufferings and death, with the final issue. So constantly does John adhere to this plan that Dr. Dods is convinced that his gospel is a work of art, without a literary blemish, such as a defective sentence or a pair of ill-mated paragraphs. He makes an exception of the incident of the woman taken in adultery so far as to say that it is not found in the latest Greek texts, but as it is in the English version and contains "good gospel material," suited to the synoptics rather than to John's ideal, he applauds its character and lessons, and believes its admission will do no harm. He has reproduced the times of the Saviour with great exactness and re-interpreted the gospel according to the reproduction. The book is faithful to the gospel in its history and the chronological relation of its events, and the author has written in the spirit, though not always in the style, of a just and scholarly commentator. The book holds a high place in the series to which it belongs.

*Historical Evidences of the Old Testament.* 12mo, pp. 319. New York: American Tract Society. Price, cloth, \$1.

*Historical Evidences of the New Testament.* 12mo, pp. 323. New York: American Tract Society. Price, cloth, \$1.

These volumes consist of a series of papers by eminent writers in vindication of the historical and ethical integrity of the Holy Scriptures. Miscellaneous in character, they are wanting in that unity that is necessary to homogeneity; but they consider the more prominent questions of critical controversy, and serve a very important purpose in the study of the Bible. Of essential value are the papers, in the first volume, of Professor Sayce on "The Witness of Ancient Monuments in the Old Testament Scriptures," Principal Cairns on the "Present State of the Christian Argument from Prophecy," and Dr. Conder's inquiry into "The Origin of the Hebrew Religion;" and in the second volume the papers of Dr. Bruce on "F. C. Baur and his Theory of the Origin of Christianity and of the New Testament Writings," and of Dr. Stoughton on "Unity of Faith a Proof of the Divine Origin and Preservation of Christianity," will command the close attention of the reader. Professor Sayce refutes the criticism on biblical history that it represents Oriental civilization by too extravagant colors, and that writing was unknown to the Jews of the Mosaic period, by showing from monuments in Babylonia, Egypt, and Assyria the nature and work of that civilization, and that it is perfectly set forth in the Old Testament records; and also that writing was in vogue long

anterior to the times of Moses. As the monuments and the Bible agree, the critic cannot reject the one without rejecting the other, or, what is the same thing, without rejecting established history. Dr. Cairns vindicates the Messianic prophecies, overthrowing Strauss and all who like him eliminate the supernatural element from the Old Testament. Dr. Conder refutes the theory that the Hebrew religion had its origin either in paganism or the national genius of the Hebrews. He holds that its origin is disclosed in the Pentateuch, but that the modern repugnance to miracles has led to the rejection of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and finally to the rejection of the supernatural origin of the Hebrew religion. Dr. Bruce, with impartial discrimination, traces the growth of negativism in Baur, with the final development of the Tübingen school in antagonism to Christianity. Dr. Stoughton makes good use of the unity of faith in the Christian world in proof of the truth of the Christian religion. We have not indicated either all the writers or the various subjects discussed in these volumes, but we have reported enough to indicate their spirit and general orthodox character. In the absence of specific treatises on all these lines these volumes may be read with profit, especially because they furnish affirmative arguments for the faith of the Church touching the literary character and spiritual worth of the Bible.

*The Epic of the Inner Life.* Being the Book of Job. Translated Anew and Accompanied with Notes and an Introductory Study. By JOHN F. GENUNG. 16mo, pp. 352. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

Here is an interesting, and in some respects an original, study of the book of Job. The author translates from the Hebrew, interpreting in the act of translation, and unfolds a theoretic exposition of the teachings of the sacred poem in accordance with his presuppositions of Hebrew literature generally. His work bears the marks of a certain boldness and independence that separate it from similar works, but which do not add to its special value. It is not an absolute proof of genius or of transcendent ability in the author that he differs with others in their conception of the origin, design, or nature of this poem; yet the impression is made that he relies more or less upon his isolated interpretation for literary celebrity. No standard or historic conception of Job is satisfactory to him. He repudiates the theory of a didactic purpose in the book, and yet in final conclusion is as didactic as his predecessors or contemporaries. In this respect his originality fails, though the author is quite unconscious of the failure. Nor is the suggestion of the epic character of the poem original with him, for it is as old as many other suggestions respecting it; but the development of the poem as an epic, with a hero for the central figure, is masterly, and entitles the author to great credit. Studying the poem in the light of his interpretation, its grandeur of construction and its significance of teaching appear to great advantage. We really forget the small blemishes we have mentioned when we consider the great design of the author, the patient labor expended in its execution, and the rich and partially new lessons of providence and life he finds in the revelations of the

wonderful poem. He also discovers a continuity of thought and plan in the book that establishes its literary unity and demonstrates its single authorship. The writer's views on this point are the product of close and intricate examination, and heighten our estimate both of his work and of the poem he interprets. We did not expect him to designate the author, or even the period of its composition, but upon these unsolved problems he writes judiciously and helpfully. We may not agree with him in every translation, or accept all his annotations, but he opens new doors at intervals into the poem, and points to long passage-ways into hidden meanings that reward the investigator who enters and follows. The book is not the final interpretation, but it is a valuable addition to those helps in Hebrew literature which critical minds will appreciate.

ΚΟΑΑΣΙΣ ΑΙΩΝΙΟΣ; or, Future Retribution. By GEORGE W. KING, Pastor of the Broadway Methodist Episcopal Church, Providence, R. I. 12mo, pp. 267. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price, cloth, \$1.

The frequency with which scholars debate the future destiny of the wicked is commensurate with the great importance of the subject discussed. That Mr. King has ventured to add a volume to the many treatises on this phase of eschatology will renew an already intense interest in the subject. In so far as a work upon ground so often traversed may be novel the author has constructed an original volume. His scrutiny of the Scriptures, among others Matthew xxvi, 46, which gives name to his book, shows the instincts and the painstaking of the scholar. Two of his conclusions will receive the confirmation of most thinkers—that the Scripture establishes the fact of future endless retribution, and that the detailed nature of this retribution remains uncertain. To his argument that character cannot become fixed beyond the possibility of grace to reclaim, exception may be taken by some; in support of which certain proof-passages might be quoted which seem to establish irremediable fixation. With this specific argument held in abeyance the logic, treatment, and general thoroughness of Mr. King's work are to be commended.

*Christianity and Childhood*; or, The Relation of Children to the Church. By R. J. COOKE, A.M., D.D., Professor of Theology in the U. S. Grant University, Author of *Outlines of Doctrine of the Resurrection*, etc. 12mo, pp. 230. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 90 cents.

In few regards is the contrast between Christianity and heathenism more marked than in their respective attitude toward childhood. If the former is the conservator of the interests of children the latter has ever been the unfeeling enemy to their happiness and even the executioner to slay them. Such a chapter does Dr. Cooke open in the records of Greece, Rome, Phenicia, and other heathen nations, as preparatory to the brighter picture of the interest of Christianity in child-life which he essays to draw. We are not prepared to dispute this disposition of the Christian Church to give a shelter within its walls to tender childhood and youth. Such is alike the example which the great Founder himself set for imitation and

also the history of the Church through eighteen centuries of practice. But, accepting this as fact, it is rather the reason that justifies child-membership in the Church with which we are particularly concerned. This reason is discovered by Professor Cooke in the fact that "the state of the living infant is essentially the same for an infant as the state into which regeneration brings the adult." Such a view of the relation of infants to the atonement is tenable, and affords Dr. Cooke a solid basis upon which to erect his argument. Without finding it possible to particularize the details of his reasoning we may register our approval of his logic, spirit, and evident historical research. His volume is an addition to this department of ecclesiastical literature.

*An Introduction to the Old Testament.* By the Rev. CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., Ph.D., Examiner in Hebrew and New Testament Greek in the University of London, etc. 12mo, pp. 226. New York: Thomas Whittaker. Price, cloth, 75 cents.

In brief space the author prepares the reader for a critical study of the Old Testament. We do not mean that he discusses at length any historic point or elaborates any critical problem which some of the books, as the pentateuchal and the prophetic, suggest; but he says enough on the subject to stimulate the student to investigation for himself, and aids him in original work by pointing to those sources of information which are indispensable to final results. He is particularly valuable in his history of the Hebrew text, and not less so in sketching the relation of the *Massora* and the *Targums* to Old Testament literature. Besides, he aims to furnish a list of books, with their authors, that treat of the various books of the Old Testament, selecting critical writers of conservative and destructive instincts, so that one may have both sides of all questions. In the general discussion of the books he is influenced by criticism, but only in the minor points, for he maintains the historical view and rebukes with evident plainness the evil work of the destructionists. However, in this discriminating analysis he is unsatisfactory because he is incomplete, and but for its awakening effect would be mildly perplexing. The book is of interest, therefore, both for what it contains and its power to energize the mind into inquiry.

*The Book of Ecclesiastes.* With a New Translation. By SAMUEL COX, D.D., Author of *Commentaries on Job, Ruth*, etc. 12mo, pp. 335. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

In the minute scrutiny that present scholarship is devoting to the separate books of the Scripture canon it is not difficult to understand the specific attention here and elsewhere given to Ecclesiastes. The fact that it has place at all among the sacred books would justify its most careful study; its subject-matter and its side instructions upon the philological, sociological, and ethical conditions of Jewish times make its scrutiny one of the clear duties of Christian scholarship. As to its author Dr. Cox has no new information to give. In his own summation he believes him to be an "unknown sage" long subsequent to the reign of Solomon, who,



by a blending of his personal experiences with the Solomonic traditions, "sought to console and instruct his oppressed fellow-countrymen." It is interesting to follow his argumentation in support of this view, which such scholars as Ewald, De Wette, Ginsburg, and others, have maintained, basing proof of the modern date of the book in the Hebraic idioms and style, and also on the internal evidences as disproving the traditional authorship of Ecclesiastes. Such a line of reasoning is important in the striking of the balance, and certainly goes for much in the present treatment of the author. In the interpretation of the spirit of Ecclesiastes we cannot but feel that Dr. Cox is most felicitous. The search for the chief good being, in his judgment, the purpose of the book, the successive quest for this good in wisdom, pleasure, devotion to public affairs, wealth, and the golden mean is portrayed by the unknown writer. To illustrate this purpose Dr. Cox has given to the reader a new and happy translation of the text. Whoever reads it with carefulness will discover a fresh charm in Ecclesiastes and will view in a new light the Old Testament age which it describes. The pessimist will find it a not altogether dolorous meditation on the brevity and sorrow of human life, but a treatise that, in its philosophic view of destiny, makes for cheerfulness. The careless will find in it an antidote to his ease and aimlessness and an inspiration to personal toil. As a discursive and general volume the book is among the best of its class.

#### PHILOSOPHY, LANGUAGE, AND GENERAL SCIENCE.

*What is Reality?* An Inquiry as to the Reasonableness of Natural Religion, and the Naturalness of Revealed Religion. By FRANCIS HOWE JOHNSON. 12mo, pp. 510. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, \$2.

In these pages natural religion, so called, has a reasonable defense, to which no objection can be made, while the "naturalness" or scientific status of revealed religion has ample and satisfactory demonstration. As to the two subjects treated, though in spirit they are one, we prefer the second to the first, since a supernatural religion is a higher essential than one grounded in natural or *a priori* principles. In the method of treatment pursued by the author he is unquestionably more vigorous, though perhaps neither more fluent nor more logical in handling the one than the other. Fundamental to both religions in their human elements are the same underlying principles, and therefore the vindication of the natural prepares the reader for the broader though more difficult interpretation of the supernatural. In commencing his investigations of both religions the author constantly starts from the same conceptions of primary truth, or from the same primary truths. This is a scientific procedure not always observed either by scientists or theologians, who in consequence fall into error before they have gone far toward conclusions. The chief thought of the book pertains to reality—the basis of all thought, of all things. It is confessed that the subject is discussed philosophically, an appeal to revelation being considered inad-



equate, for it assumes a spiritual reality which science questions. But in going to philosophy for an answer he returns without one from the idealists, as Fichte and Hegel, and finds that Herbert Spencer, the great English representative of physical realism, rules out free-will and purposive action, while all realists exclude one half of reality. Hence, he is driven to *life* as the explanation of the thing-in-itself, or the ground and expression, and therefore the proof, of reality. With this basal principle he begins the examination of the universe in which he finds natural religion, the radical idea of which is the immanency and transcendency of God. Philosophically, he is bound to interpret God as the creative intelligence, acting under the limitations of ends and means; and he is also bound to consider the theory of God as an unconscious intelligence, concluding in both sketches in favor of the theism of revelation. As, therefore, natural religion points to some of the truths of revelation, revelation appears to be a natural result of a natural process and stands on impregnable foundations. Remembering that this conclusion has been reached, not as a prepossession, but by the step of a self-evident logic, it must be accepted just as any other scientific conclusion is accepted. Hitherto revelation has been interpreted as unnatural, or preternatural, or supernatural; but the author furnishes a reason for believing that it is natural. From this lofty point of observation he views Christianity in its many-sidedness, first examining the elementary principles of the Christian Church, then showing that infallibility, as applied to the Bible, is a survival of the catholic type, and in conclusion affirming that miracles were intended to stimulate, not suppress, the religious reason. In these discussions he controverts some accepted views, and is open to criticism, especially when he says that revelation helps the reason but is not a substitute for it, for the revelations of the Trinity, atonement, resurrection, and heaven and hell, are *substitutes* for unaided reason. Nevertheless, it is because he affirms some new things, and questions certain old beliefs, more to re-adapt them to ideal standards than obliterate them, that he deserves the candid hearing of scholars. The work of re-adjustment or scientific verification of ethical and religious beliefs is a necessity, and our age is to be encouraged in undertaking to find if supernatural truth is verifiable by the scientific process. This book is exceptional for originality, philosophic acumen, and direct investigation of religious problems from other than religious view-points.

*Manual of the Science of Religion.* By P. D. CHANTEPIE DE LA SAUSSAYE, Professor of Theology at Amsterdam. Translated from the German by BEATRICE S. COLYER-FERGUSON (née Max Müller). 12mo, pp. 672. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. Price, cloth, \$3.50.

Religion, as a whole, is a comprehensive subject, including its history, its philosophy, and its science. The history of religion has engaged the attention, more or less, of thinkers, who, however, largely excluding the political history of man, have been narrow in their investigations and given conclusions that subsequently discovered facts have overthrown. It is not

enough to trace a particular religion to its source or to follow it in its development; all religions, pagan as well as Christian, must be studied in the same way, their points of resemblance and dissimilarity being noted, and their ancestral course indicated. Scarcely yet has this broad conception prevailed in the study of religious ideas and institutions. Then, too, it is all-important that a religion should be interpreted philosophically—that is, its causes and effects should be marked with the care that the historian exhibits in gathering his facts. Kant, and even more strikingly Hegel, sought to discuss the subject from the philosophical view-point, stimulating other minds to researches, and really elevating religion above the level of a commonplace. It still remained for religion to be treated scientifically, or with the aids of history, philology, psychology, biology, ethnography, and all the appliances of modern civilization. Max Müller may be credited with pioneering scientific minds in this direction and giving to religious study a scientific bias that promises further disclosures in the field of scientific fact. Until we are prepared to regard religion as much a science as a history we are unprepared to account for its origin or accurately report its development. In connection with this view appears the real value of this book. Its basis is the scientific conception of religion, or as an historic growth according to scientific processes. This conception or process the author rigidly applies to all religions except Judaism and Christianity, holding that these are separate in their origin and history, and yet within their limitations they exhibit the phenomenal marks of true science. In his treatment of other religions, especially the more ancient, as those of Babylon and Assyria, India and Egypt, China and Africa, he deals with a class of facts not altogether new, but, interpreting them scientifically, they have a new meaning, and in his hands religion takes a broader form. It happens, too, as a result, whether he intends or not, that he furnishes an argument for the kinship of the races by showing the kinship of their religions and the similarity of their historical development. Thus results not anticipated, and throwing light upon fundamental problems, are secured while the main purpose of the book is maintained. In itself the volume is rich in materials and suggestive of much that has been withheld, and as a preparation for the succeeding volume on other religions it is indispensable. It is the sum of investigation respecting the origin, history, and scientific aspect of religion written by one equipped for his task, and satisfactory in style, compass, plan of preparation, and final elevating intellectual and ethical tendency.

*The Spirit of Man.* An Essay in Christian Philosophy. By ARTHUR CHANDLER, M.A., Fellow and late Tutor of Brasenose College, Oxford. 12mo, pp. 227. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.75.

The object of the book is to demonstrate on philosophical grounds, though in the light of scriptural teaching, that man is a spiritual personality, with capacity for knowledge of the reality of things and for communion with God. The author aims to extricate man from the meshes of

metaphysics in which his individuality disappears, and from the complexities of mere sophism in which he concentrates selfish force. He holds that the mission of Christ was to impart to man a spiritual life which in its unfolding is distinguished for individual traits, instincts, endowments, and prerogatives. He further declares that the spiritualized individuality of man is the basis of human freedom, and that freedom thus acquired is the basis of responsibility; and that human society in its various customs and institutions harmonizes with this conception of man and is co-operating for its realization. We have the conclusion, or theory, fully stated in advance, all the chapters being so many arguments supporting it. In these materialistic days the vindication of the spiritual character of man, with what it is in itself and what it receives from Christ in the process of regeneration, is a necessity, and to be commended for its opportuneness. It is freely admitted, too, that the author writes altogether in a philosophical vein, showing mature study of the points at issue and the fruits of a broad and scholarly mind. He grapples with the most obscure as the most obvious difficulties of his theme, evincing discrimination in thought and an intelligent appreciation of the relations of philosophy to Christianity. He also seems to recognize, in the progress of his discussion, that whatever truth may be sustained by the philosophical process is of importance to the Christian faith, and so he weaves together those truths that, essentially philosophical in spirit, such as reality, knowledge, life, virtue, and freedom, are also essentially religious. Hence, the work is as philosophical as it is religious and as religious as it is philosophical. Taking up the question of the validity of human knowledge, he examines with care the theory that knowledge is a copy of the external world, reaching the conclusion that it is insufficient to account for all the facts in the case, and other theories fall under the condemnation that acute analysis of their nature and tendencies justifies. In stating that knowledge is a revelation of God he may be accused of suggesting an ideal result, but the statement is an "irritant" that stimulates to activity and has the merit of a great truth in it. Thus in the consideration of the subjects related to the main theme the author is original, suggestive, and helpful because stimulating, and the judgment of every candid reader will be that he has made his case.

---

#### HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

*Indika.* The Country and the People of India and Ceylon. By JOHN F. HURST, D.D., LL.D. With Maps and Illustrations. 8vo, pp. 794. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$5.

We approach a great literary work, implying erudition, observation, reflection, skill in combining materials, and an exhaustless patience in its preparation, with something of the reverential feeling that possesses us as we stand in the presence of a monumental work of art, or contemplate the sublimity of a mountain or other grand object in nature. In other words,

we respect greatness, whether in literature, art, mechanism, or nature. *Indika* takes immediate rank with those books that survive their authors and continue to instruct, elevate, and guide the opinion of generations yet to come. It is a work that will supplant, with English readers, all others on the same subject and be accepted as an authority in its statements on the government, languages, and religions of India. The book derives character and standing from its author, who, on an official visit to India, had amplest opportunity as well as sufficient time for the investigation of the questions that particularly concerned him, and for a leisurely and therefore satisfactory observation of the general life and customs of India, concerning which he has written so carefully and in detail. Nor did Bishop Hurst wholly rely upon these opportunities, nor investigate as an amateur traveler excited by the novelty of Oriental scenes and moved to represent them by excessive coloring. Besides being well equipped as a scholar for study in any land, he had familiarized himself with Indian affairs long before his visit by most discriminating reading and by intelligent conversations with returned missionaries and native Hindus whom he met at various times and places. It is not extravagant to say that he could have written a work on India had he never surveyed the country or landed on its borders, so at home was he with Indian lore; but he could not have written *Indika*. The work from his pen is proof of his eminent qualifications for the task he undertook to accomplish, and is in itself a pyramid of industry and a marvel of information respecting a country which formerly was the seat of the Aryan race, and is now inhabited by a people who under British influence are the most enterprising and the most hopeful of the Asian peoples. Historically, ethnographically, religiously we are linked to India, and this work gains in its hold upon us by virtue of ancestral associations.

It is a characteristic of the work that it combines history with personal narrative and artistic description of India as it is to-day. Hence, India, past, present, and future, appears to the reader in nearly every chapter; while from the beginning to the end a logical order of variation is observed with those intervening pictures of present-day life that charm as one gazes upon them, and leave an impression of Oriental magnificence that will endure as long as the book remains in memory. Bishop Hurst captivates us with his tracing of Anglo-Saxon antecedents in Indian history, and then deliberately unfolds that history, with the multitudinous invasions, conquests, and expulsions of foreign peoples, including the Aryan conquest, the Brahman, and subsequently the Buddhist and Greek supremacy, the Mohammedan dynasties, the Mogul emperors, and the Europeans in India, bringing the whole to the present rule of the English in that land. Without any tarrying he characterizes the government of the country, with its various improvements, as railroads, telegraphs, canals, and postal system, together with roads, ways of travel, and social customs, and considers at length the educational system of India, with the battle of the English with the Indian languages, and the prospects of existing universities. To many of his readers the chapters will be most interesting that unveil the

religious condition of India, with the work and prospect of the ultimate triumph of Christianity in that hopeful land. On this subject he deals fairly and fully with Roman Catholicism in its effort to overthrow the old faiths, with skepticism introduced from civilized lands, and with certain reformatory movements that have sprung up among the educated natives. We also read of the opium curse, of poverty, of temples, of ruins; but we must refer the reader to the book to know what is in it. Not the least valuable chapter is the last, on the advantages of English rule in India, the author justly concluding that it is fast introducing a Christian civilization to the greatest people of the continent. With its maps and illustrations, and the exquisite mechanical work of the publishers, added to the superior work of the author, the book is lacking in nothing that would contribute to its value or usefulness.

*The Franco-German War of 1870-71.* By Field-Marshal Count HELMUTH VON MOLTKE. Translated by CLARA BELL and HENRY W. FISCHER. With a Map. 8vo, pp. 432. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$3.

A man of war, of "blood and iron," after much persuasion consents to write the German military view of the Franco-German War of 1870-71. He breaks his silence for the sake of history and in the interest of the future peace of the nations. It is not strange that he justifies war when a sufficient reason for it exists; but it is pleasant to know that he anticipates the time when kingdoms shall strive no more on the battle-field. It is he who says that "as long as nations continue independent of each other there will be disagreements that can only be settled by force of arms; but in the interest of humanity it is to be hoped that wars will become less frequent, as they have become more terrible." He takes up his pen, not in the spirit of a conqueror, but rather of an historian, detailing cold and bloody facts because compelled to do so, and he is always seemingly anxious to be fair and impartial in his estimates and judgments of both sides. It is this characteristic, re-enforced by the weight of the personal dignity of the author, recently deceased, that will attract his readers and render the work less liable to criticism even from those who take a different view of the conflict he describes. From his lofty position as hero; from his full knowledge of the origin, progress, and issues of the war; and from his actual participation in its plans and results, he might have been prompted to a defiant and boastful and even egotistic style of writing, irritating the French and exalting the Germans beyond warrant. This extreme he avoids, and writes in a modest and respectful tone, careful as to the truth of what he writes. The book could not be more authentic than it is, because Von Moltke compiled the data he uses from the official records of the war, besides drawing upon his private journals and personal recollections. From the German view, therefore, his history of the war is reliable, dignified, and an honest expression of the sentiments and purposes of Germany. Excepting a few pages devoted to preparations for war, the book begins with a battle and continues amid roar and smoke until the flag of peace crowns the scene. In description

the author is brief, vivid, striking; but he does not compare with General Grant in revealing plans of a battle or campaign, or in describing the crisis of conflict when it came. He writes as if in motion in order to keep up with the rapid movements of the army, and yet omits nothing essential to a strong impression. In describing the advance he is picturesque, while his account of the capitulation of Metz is without passion or color. Of active operations in the provinces and the general progress of the war at all points he aims to present the history without imagination, without hypocrisy, without enthusiasm. He sends a cannon-ball into France, and the empire dies—this is the whole story, told without circumlocution, told in generous recognition of the bravery and military skill of other officers, told in fraternal regard for the foe whom he subdued, but who then, as now, is worthy of some homage—the homage due to her history.

*Christopher Columbus.* And How he Received and Imparted the Spirit of Discovery. By JUSTIN WINSOR. 8vo, pp. 674. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, \$4.

The voyages and discoveries of Columbus have elicited many biographies and altogether a vast and speculative literature, the chief writers being Spanish, French, German, Italian, English, and American. The earliest books were principally devoted to the subject of navigation, plans of conquest, and a Romish sanctification or appropriation of great enterprises. Few if any of these are now consulted except to learn the spirit of those days and the obstacles to commercial activity. In these times a more reliable and fascinating literature is appearing, especially as the discovery of the New World in 1492 is to be celebrated in this country, with the co-operation of other nations, not many months hence. Under these circumstances a work comprehensive in plan, historical in style, and omitting nothing essential to a study of the achievement, with its far-reaching significance, is required; and it affords us pleasure to say that Justin Winsor has produced a volume that meets all the necessary conditions of an interesting book. As one great work is worth more than a score of inferior books, so this volume will be regarded as a substitute for the common works in popular use, and will properly take its place on the shelves of the very best books written by our most eminent historians. In power of description, in succinctness of narration, and in a happy combination of materials so as to give a progressive cast to the history, the author rivals our most excellent writers, and becomes himself famous by this literary product. He pictures Columbus from his youth through the critical periods of voyaging to his death and burial, with the geographical results of discovery from the times of the Ptolemies to the present day, and in a way that wins while it instructs. We have here fully delineated his personal troubles and the interest that Portugal, Spain, and the pope took in the result of his discovery. We have also narrated the attempt and exploits of other navigators, some of whom, from jealousy and cupidity, would deprive Columbus of that honor that will never be taken away. His memory survives, and his work is an



everlasting monument that the tooth of time cannot gnaw down. As a record of that history which is inseparable from American civilization this book deserves careful reading and the unquestioned confidence of students and scholars.

*Hindu Literature*; or, The Ancient Books of India. By ELIZABETH A. REED, Member of the Philosophical Society of Great Britain. 12mo, pp. 410. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. Price, cloth, \$2.

India has produced not only the cocoanut, the palm, and the stately mango, but also the Vedas, the legends of the Mahabharata, and the comparatively modern Puranas. The task of examining the literary products of the ancient people of India, as largely written in Sanskrit, requires special qualifications in the examiner and the devotion of years to its accomplishment. Fortunately the author was adapted to this task, and the result is a work of pronounced value. Students and scholars who cannot take the time for original investigation will be thankful that in the compass of an ordinary volume the historical character and development of every Aryan literature is so satisfactorily set forth both in respect to contents and style. It will be conceded that the author's researches in Vedic literature are from original sources, and that her discussion of its origin and influence is comprehensive and effective. Nor in the specific treatment of the code of Manu, and the cosmogony, anthropology, and eschatology of the Hindus, is the author less watchful of the origin of ideas or the progress of scientific and religious thought. In her study of the Ramayana, a sacred epic of India, she discovers an internal and external beauty, and indulges in an interpretation that, whether altogether acceptable or not, discloses her own power in analysis and understanding as well as the latent virtues of the poem itself. When she considers the Puranas she deals with an inferior literature, but allows it some elevation of motive and not a little power over those for whom it was prepared. To summarize the work, it is enough to say that it contains the philosophy, science, language, literature, and religion of the ancient Hindus as embodied in poems, hymns, histories, laws, and didactic treatises, and the whole is presented in an orderly and attractive form, making it a most valuable hand-book on the subject which it treats.

*Darkness and Daylight*; or, Lights and Shadows of New York Life. A Woman's Narrative of Mission and Rescue Work in Tough Places, with Personal Experiences Among the Poor in Regions of Poverty and Vice, etc. The Whole Portraying Life in Darkest New York by Day and by Night. Superbly Illustrated with Two Hundred and Fifty Engravings, etc. By MRS. HELEN CAMPBELL, Colonel THOMAS W. KNOX, Inspector THOMAS BYRNES. 8vo, pp. 740. Hartford: A. D. Worthington & Co. Sold only by subscription.

Great cities are great centers of destitution and vice. Wherever the masses dwell in municipal relations the excess of the supply over the demand for unskilled labor is naturally productive of bitter poverty for the unemployed, while the presence of the vicious among the better disposed inevitably causes the spread of moral contagion and an ever-increasing



list of crimes. So certain are these features of metropolitan association that our Christianity, with its solvent power, has as yet accomplished only the mitigation of these evils of corporate life, not their complete extermination. The greatest city of the western hemisphere is certainly no exception to the above rules. Were it possible for one to have lived in blindness to the destitution of New York, or in deafness to its jargon voices of evil, the present volume would come to such with undeceiving force. Its authors have at least the fitness of intimate acquaintance with their subject to recommend their volume. A woman well known in the charitable work of New York, a journalist trained in shrewdness by the demands of his profession, and one of the renowned detectives of the world, now at the head of the New York department, join in the present collaboration. With descriptions sufficiently graphic for all legitimate purposes of information they have united in picturing the wassail and wantonness of New York, its pinching poverty, its festering centers of disease and vice. If any thing is missing from their lavish descriptions, the insertion of many illustrations obtained at much expense and effort complete the realistic quality of the book. As to the benefit of such a volume, it must be held that only a worthy purpose can justify its publication. Sensational works portraying the miseries and uncleanness of lower city life have sometimes been published for financial profit and with the intention of pandering to the prurient curiosity of miscellaneous readers. The present volume will contribute to better ends. So far as an accurate understanding of the social degradation of a metropolis is necessary in reformatory work the book affords an unusually full compendium of information. In the absence, also, of cheap and meretricious features philanthropic and Christian workers will doubtless be glad to make it an authority of frequent reference.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

*Illustrative Notes.* A Guide to the Sunday-School Lessons for 1892. Including Original and Selected Expositions, Plans of Instruction, Illustrative Anecdotes, Practical Applications, Archaeological Notes, Library References, Maps, Pictures, Diagrams. By JESSE L. HURLBUT, D.D., and ROBERT R. DOHERTY, Ph.D. 8vo, pp. 396. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Sowe. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

The multiplication of Sunday-school helps, both for adult and infant use, must not be regarded as altogether a sordid movement on the part of publishers in hope of gain. It rather has its basis in the increasing demand for terse and practical comments on the series of International Lessons. In obedience to this demand the publishing-houses of all denominations are perhaps increasing the variety and numbers of their Sunday-school helps. Without disparagement of the most excellent of their issues we are persuaded that the *Illustrative Notes* for 1892 must take front rank among them all. Whether the quality of the work performed or the method of its arrangement be under criticism it will endure the severest test. Dr. Doherty, who has performed most of the labor upon the book, has given

the Church the superlative volume of the series in this issue for 1892. In comment it is painstaking; in typography, engraving, and colored maps it is most tasteful. It should have a large sale.

*The Afro-American Press and its Editors.* By I. GARLAND PENN, Principal in Lynchburg, Va., Schools, and Ex-Editor of Lynchburg, Va., *Laborer*; with Contributions by Hon. Frederick Douglass, Hon. John R. Lynch, etc. 12mo, pp. 569. Springfield: Willey & Co.

The development of the African race since the war of the rebellion is one of the romances of modern history. In general improvement of educational advantages, in the successful application of the mechanical arts, and in ability to grasp the intricate problems of statesmanship the black man has already demonstrated his sovereignty and given pledge of larger successes in the future. What he has accomplished in the department of religious and secular journalism Mr. Penn satisfactorily shows in the present volume. To readers unacquainted with the facts here set forth the book must come as a revelation. Outlining the history of the movement in favor of the slaves prior to the rebellion the author afterward traces in detail the work of the freedmen in the journalistic field until the present. Frequent portraits and ample biographical sketches serve to emphasize the epoch which is under discussion. A large research and a patient compilation of facts are indicated in the volume and make it one to be commended.

*The Rime of the Ancient Mariner and Christabel.* By SAMUEL T. COLERIDGE. 24mo, pp. 82.

*Lyrics.* By ROBERT BROWNING. 24mo, pp. 101.

*The Legend of Sleepy Hollow.* By WASHINGTON IRVING. 24mo, pp. 85.

*Pre-Raphaelitism.* By JOHN RUSKIN, LL.D. 24mo, pp. 91.

*John Bright on America.* The Trent Affair; Slavery and Secession; The Struggle in America, 1861-63. 24mo, pp. 106.

*The Education of Children.* By MICHAEL SEIGNEUR DE MONTAIGNE. 24mo, pp. 112.

This series of well-known prose and poetical works is from the press of G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. The high quality of the authorship here represented needs no elucidation. The set is attractively bound in morocco. Its size will permit its volumes to be easily carried and read in leisure moments. It constitutes the third series of *Literary Gems*, and is appropriately named.

*Then and Now.* A Sixtieth Anniversary Sermon. By Rev. ADAM MILLER, M.D., Author of *Life in Other Worlds*, etc.

Dr. Miller delivered the sermon before the Cincinnati Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Urbana, O., September 7, 1891, and it is published by request of the Conference. Besides abounding in entertaining and instructive reminiscences it combats the theories of materialistic science, showing that the Gospel is the only instrument for enlightening mankind and pulling down the strongholds of sin, ignorance, and error.

*Favorite Water-Colors.* New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. Price, \$7.50.

As a book of its class—a work of art—it is without a rival. It contains the fac-similes of favorite works by Francis Day, Charles Howard Johnson, H. W. McVickar, Percy Moran, James M. Barnsley, and James Symington, with portraits of the artists and representations of their works in black and white. In mechanical outfit—paper, length and breadth of page, and type—it is superior, while in colors, portraits, and the general effect of the whole it is as captivating as a picture-gallery, with beauty and simplicity rivaling for recognition. For holiday purposes it is superb and a great success.

*The Good Things of Life.* Eighth Series. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. Price, \$2.

Another work of art from this popular publishing company, consisting of various comic, tragic, and sober scenes and experiences in life in representative engravings, with accompanying conversations and self-evident explanations.

*A Galahad of Nowadays.* By MARTHA BURR BANKS, Author of *The Children's Summer*, etc. 12mo, pp. 354. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price, cloth, \$1.20.

*Sheila.* By ANNIE S. SWAN, Author of *Gates of Eden*, etc. 12mo, pp. 381. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 90 cents.

*The Colonel's Charge.* A Companion Volume to *The Little Corporal.* By CARLISLE B. HOLDING. 12mo, pp. 354. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 90 cents.

*The Gilead Guards.* A Story of War-Times in a New England Town. By MRS. O. W. SCOTT, Author of *Santa Claus Stories*, etc. 12mo, pp. 300. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price, cloth, \$1.

*Number One, or Number Two.* By MARY E. BAMFORD, Author of *Father Lambert's Family*, etc. 12mo, pp. 292. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price, cloth, \$1.

*Rockton.* A Story of Spring-Time Recreations. By KEL SNOW, Esq. 12mo, pp. 280. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 90 cents.

*The South Ward.* By KATHARINE DOOKES SHARP, Author of *Eleanor's Courtship* and *The Songs that Sang Themselves*. 12mo, pp. 299. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 90 cents.

*Una and Leo; or, Changes and Chances.* By JULIA GOODFELLOW. 12mo, pp. 276. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price, cloth, \$1.

Healthful in sentiment, excellent in composition, and attractive in print, the above group of books is admirably adapted to the uses of Sunday-school libraries. As Christmas volumes of this sort they are to be recommended.

